DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 648 EA 032 553

AUTHOR	Hare, Debra; Heap, James L.
TITLE	Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Naperville, IL.
PUB DATE	2001-05-00
NOTE	95p.; Several appended tables contain cropped text.
AVAILABLE FROM	North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200, Naperville, IL 60563. Tel: 630-649-6500; Tel: 800-356-2735 (Toll Free); Fax: 630-649-6700; e-mail: info@ncrel.org; Web site: http://www.ncrel.org. For full text: http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/html/strategy/index.html.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Recruitment; Labor Turnover; Teacher Background; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Persistence; Teacher Placement; *Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Selection; Teacher Shortage; Teacher Supply and Demand; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Michigan; Minnesota; Ohio; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

In fall 2000, all 3,506 superintendents in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin received a survey that asked them to report on the strategies they had implemented to attract and retain teachers and on how effective those strategies had been. The survey was designed to collect basic information about a variety of strategies cited in the literature as possible solutions for recruitment and retention problems. The strategies were those that could be implemented at the school-district level. A total of 2,413 surveys were returned. This document is a report on the results of the survey responses. The goal of the study was to discover successful recruitment and retention strategies to provide guidance to schools and school districts. Many of the districts responding to the survey were indeed having difficulties attracting and keeping teachers. The results of the study are organized into three sections. Section 1 is devoted to new-teacher support programs. Section 2 looks at various retention strategies. Section 3 reports on various recruitment strategies. The report concludes with recommendations for school and state policymakers. Appended are the survey instrument and the results in tabular form. (Contains 26 tables.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 477 648

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Debra Hare
James L. Heap

May 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Buckley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

EA 032 553

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

May 2001

Prepared for the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory by:

Debra Hare
Associate Director
Center for School Change
University of Minnesota

and

James L. Heap
Professor and Dean
College of Education
Ohio University

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments
Introduction
Methods and Limitations
Section 1: Survey Results for New Teacher Support Programs
Section 2: Survey Results for Other Retention Strategies
Section 3: Survey Results for Recruitment Strategies
Conclusions
Recommendations
References
Appendix A. Survey Instrument
Appendix B. Tables

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

EA 032553

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the many organizations and individuals who contributed to this study by providing input, encouragement, and support.

We are most grateful to the 2,413 superintendents who responded to the survey. They took time from their busy schedules to share their experiences with us so that we can share them with you. Support from the following administrator organizations and their leadership was instrumental in the strong response to our survey:

- Buckeye Association of School Administrators (Richard Maxwell, Executive Director)
- Illinois Association of School Administrators (Dr. Walter Warfield, Executive Director)
- Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (Dr. Roger Thornton, Executive Director)
- Michigan Association of School Administrators (Michael Emlaw, Associate Executive Director)
- Minnesota Association of School Administrators (Dr. Charles Kyte, Executive Director)
- School Administrators of Iowa (Dr. Gaylord Tryon, Executive Director)
- Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators (Dr. Miles Turner, Executive Director)

Each of these organizations wrote a letter of support for the survey and encouraged their members to participate. We deeply appreciate their involvement in the study.

The research would not have been possible without the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). NCREL provided not only financial support for the survey but also leadership on the issue of attracting and retaining teachers—both in the Midwest region and nationally. This study is just one part of NCREL's ongoing commitment to this important issue. NCREL sought input from state educational leaders on their

information needs and produced this report as a direct response to policymaker requests for more information on effective recruitment and retention strategies. NCREL staff members Sabrina Laine and Judy Taylor reviewed the writing, Arie van der Ploeg provided assistance with research data, and Jan Gahala edited the report.

State agency staff in NCREL's seven-state region (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) also played a key role in making this study a success. They provided valuable input on the survey design, analysis plan, and final report. They also worked with state administrator groups and provided databases for use in the study. State agency point people for this project included Peter Burke, Nancy Eberhart, Dwayne James, Judy Jeffrey, Flora Jenkins, Deb Telfer, Richard Wassen, and Connie Wise.

Finally, we would like to thank Ohio University College of Education and the University of Minnesota, Center for School Change, for their support of our work on this project. In particular, we appreciate the support of Chris Dalesandry, Joe Nathan, Martha Hardy, and Laura Accomando.

Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Introduction

Placing a high-quality teacher in front of every child in the nation is the most important thing schools can do to improve student achievement. Several research studies now confirm the obvious: Quality of teaching has a major impact on student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Lewis et al., 1999). Unfortunately, the goal of a talented, dedicated, well-prepared teacher in every classroom is far from being achieved and will only become more difficult during the next decade (Milken, 2000). During that time frame, an estimated 2.2 million teachers will need to be hired to fill the nation's classrooms (U.S. Department of Education Initiative to Ensure a Talented, Dedicated, and Well-Prepared Teacher in Every Classroom, 1999). Shortages of qualified teachers already are being felt in high-poverty communities, in certain subject areas, in certain regions of the country where enrollment growth is large, and in the availability of teachers of color (American Association for Employment in Education, 1999; Lewis et al., 1999).

Ending Teacher Shortages

Eliminating these shortages requires both recruiting talented individuals to teaching and making sure that good teachers stay in the profession after they are recruited. Estimates suggest that approximately one-fourth of all beginning teachers leave the profession in the first five years, and those rates can climb to as much as 50 percent in high-poverty areas (Bandiera de Mello & Broughman, 1996; Merrow, 1999; Whitener, Gruber, Lynch, Tingos, & Fontelier, 1997). According to the National Center for Education Statistics, teacher-attrition rates overall nationally were 6.6 percent in 1994 (Whitener, Gruber, Lynch, Tingos, & Fontelier, 1997). Current data from Midwestern states indicate that attrition rates can be as high as 9 percent (Bandiera de Mello & Broughman, 1996; Ohio's BEST, 1997). To put these figures into perspective, teacher turnover accounts for 66 percent to 75 percent of new hires (Hussar, 1999).

Policymakers face tough decisions about how to best attract and keep good teachers. A variety of Midwestern policymakers in both the legislative and executive branches of government polled by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) indicated that they needed more information about what school districts are doing to effectively recruit and retain high-quality teachers. NCREL sought to fill this gap in knowledge by conducting, with support from the Center for School Change at the University of Minnesota, a survey of school administrators in its seven-state area (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin). The survey was designed to collect basic information about which strategies have been adopted and how effective they have been at recruiting and retaining teachers.

As part of the survey, superintendents were asked whether or not their district is having difficulty retaining teachers. A total of 2,413 superintendents (or 69 percent) in the region responded to the survey. As Exhibit 1 shows, many of the districts responding to the survey are indeed having difficulty. These difficulties are being felt not only in urban and rural districts, as is widely recognized, but also in suburban districts.

High attrition rates, especially in the early years of teaching, require schools and school districts to expend tremendous energy and resources developing teachers—many of whom will eventually leave. In such a system, hiring teachers often becomes a bad investment. The odds are not favorable that a school will see a significant return on efforts and money dedicated to recruiting, hiring, training, and supporting new teachers (Haselkorn & Fiedler, 1999).

Exhibit 1
Percentage of Districts in Each State That Report Difficulty Retaining Teachers

State	Percentage and Number of Responding Districts That Are Experiencing Difficulty Retaining Teachers
Iowa	43.7% (136)
Minnesota	39.4% (109)
Illinois*	35.2% (210)
Ohio	32.8% (135)
Indiana	30.7% (65)
Wisconsin	30.6% (78)
Michigan	21.9% (77)

* School districts in Illinois are divided into three types: elementary, secondary, and combined elementary/secondary. Retention difficulties vary

by these district types. Superintendents in 28 percent (n=55) of elementary districts reported difficulty, compared to 24 percent (n=11) of secondary districts, and 44% (n=111) of combined districts. Thirty-three Illinois superintendents who reported difficulty responded anonymously and could not be linked to district type.

Keeping Good Teachers

The number of districts having difficulty keeping teachers is especially alarming because survey results suggest that *good teachers* are leaving. A majority of participating superintendents in each of the seven NCREL states reported that 75 percent to 100 percent of the teachers leaving are "highly effective" or "effective" in the classroom. Such talented individuals have other options, and they appear to be exercising them at greater rates than less-effective teachers. Confirming this finding in the Midwest is an analysis of federal survey data on teacher turnover done by *Education Week* (Edwards, 2000), which indicates that teachers who scored in the top 25 percent nationally on the SAT or the ACT assessments are more likely to leave teaching.

Effective strategies for attracting high-quality teachers and keeping them in the profession have been identified (National Association of State Boards of Education [NASBE], 1998; NASBE, 2000; Odden, 2000). Across the seven NCREL states, some school districts and schools appear to be implementing these strategies. Adequately addressing this problem, however, requires that many more districts and schools adopt strategies that work. Educators and policymakers are constantly seeking guidance on how to effectively attract and retain high-quality teachers, but unfortunately the guidance offered is rarely data-driven, research-based, or comparative in nature (Allen & Palaich, 2000). The research presented in this report is an attempt to provide such information.

Organization of the Report

The following section of the report discusses the methods for conducting the survey and the limitations of the findings. Next, the results of the survey are presented.

The first section of survey results is devoted to new teacher support programs. This section indicates the number of districts adopting such programs and describes the attributes of these programs. It also includes information about the effectiveness of these programs and the impact of state-level policies on new teacher support programs adopted at the district level.

The second section of survey results looks at other retention

strategies. It discusses the number of districts adopting various approaches, how these adoption rates vary by district characteristics, and the effectiveness of adopted strategies.

A third section of survey results reports similar information for recruitment strategies. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are presented.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

---

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Methods and Limitations

In the fall of 2000, all 3,506 superintendents in the seven contiguous Midwest states that are served by the U.S. Department of Education's North Central Regional Educational Laboratory were sent a two-page survey and a cover letter encouraging their participation from the appropriate administrator organization in their state. The survey instrument (see Appendix A) asked superintendents to report on the strategies they have implemented to attract and retain teachers and on how effective these strategies have been.

The survey was designed to collect basic information about a variety of strategies cited in the literature as possible solutions for recruitment and retention problems. The strategies included in the survey were those that can be implemented at the school-district level. (Strategies such as improved teacher preparation or loan-forgiveness programs that are implemented at other levels were not included in this survey.)

Recruitment Strategies Included in the Survey:

- Offering signing bonuses.
- Giving salary schedule credit for relevant nonteaching experience.
- Providing retraining of current staff in high needs areas.
- Training paraprofessionals to meet needs.
- Recruiting candidates from alternative preparation programs.
- Aggressively recruiting from teacher-preparation programs.
- Establishing school-university partnerships.
- Offering support to beginning teachers.
- Hiring new teachers under temporary, emergency, or provisional licenses.
- Offering salary schedule credit for higher education experience.
- Placing high-demand teachers above entry level on the salary scale.

Retention Strategies Included in the Survey:

- Providing new teacher support.
- Restructuring schools to make them smaller.
- Implementing scheduling changes that allow common planning time for same-grade or same-subject teachers.
- Implementing team or interdisciplinary teaching.
- Increasing compensation for all teachers.
- Increasing compensation for beginning teachers.
- Increasing compensation based on knowledge and skills.
- Creating career ladders for teachers involving greater responsibility for increased compensation.
- Improving staff development (other than new teacher support).
- Recruiting from and training in the community.
- Financially rewarding successful teachers.
- Financially rewarding all teachers for a school's success.
- Offering one-time financial rewards.
- Providing nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers.
- Providing support for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.
- Involving teachers in decision making.

The results of this survey reflect perceptions of school district administrators about the effectiveness of the recruitment and retention strategies they have implemented. These perceptions are important because many of the strategies are implemented at the school-district level. Superintendents also were asked specifically about how successful these approaches have been at attracting and retaining *high-quality* teachers. This distinction is important because most educators agree that the primary goal is to fill teaching positions with high-quality teachers, not just warm bodies. The term *high-quality* was defined by each superintendent for himself or herself, and the authors were interested in the perceptions of each respondent.

As Exhibit 2 indicates, 69 percent of the region's superintendents (2,413 out of 3,506) responded to the survey, resulting in a 99-percent confidence level plus or minus 1 percent for the entire region. At a 99-percent confidence level, data for individual states are plus or minus 3 percent to 5 percent. Response rates varied by state, from 60 percent in Wisconsin to 83 percent in Iowa. Responding districts were largely representative of all districts based on the size of the districts, the poverty level of districts (as measured by free and reduced-price lunch rates), and the location of districts (urban, suburban, or rural). Tables in Appendix B detail how survey responders compare to all districts.

(As noted earlier in the Exhibit 1 footnote, school districts in

Illinois are defined somewhat differently than other states. This difference accounts for the much larger number of districts in this state. Some districts in Illinois are "elementary" districts, some are "secondary" districts, and some include both types of schools. To the extent that the issues presented in this report are affected by these distinctions, data presented for Illinois may be misleading. In some exhibits, such as Exhibit 1, data for Illinois are broken down by district type in a footnote following the exhibit.)

Exhibit 2
Summary of Sample

State	Number of Districts	Number of Surveys Returned	Percentage of Surveys Returned	Two-Sided Confidence Interval (plus or minus %)
Illinois	895	596	66%	3%
Indiana	293	212	72%	4.5%
Iowa	375	311	83%	3%
Michigan	556	351	63%	4%
Minnesota	345	277	80%	2.75%
Ohio	615	411	67%	3.5%
Wisconsin	427	255	60%	5%
Region	3506	2413	69%	1%

The information reported by superintendents was linked to demographic information about the district collected in the National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data (CCD) for 1998-99. Free and reduced-price lunch levels, enrollment levels, and location were obtained from this source, resulting in common definitions across most states. Data for free and reduced-price lunches in Michigan and Illinois were not available through the CCD, however, so the data for these states were obtained from state department databases. Also, survey data could not be linked to CCD data for some districts. These districts are included in subgroup analyses as "unknown." CCD data are based on individual schools. Data linked to individual schools were combined to arrive at districtwide data.

Some superintendents elected to respond anonymously to the survey. These surveys were included in overall results for a state and are included in subgroup analyses under the category "unknown." Anonymous responders appear to be representative of all responders. Results are virtually the same whether or not these surveys are included.

Teacher recruitment and retention strategies can be highly

dependent upon the specific characteristics of the district involved. In order to address this issue, results are reported here by subgroups wherever reasonable. However, some of the subgroups are small. Throughout this report, the number of respondents, as well as the percentage, are included. It is important to be cautious about drawing conclusions when the number of respondents in a particular subgroup is very small.

Many of the statewide and regional analyses presented in this report treat each school district equally, regardless of the number of students served. When the percentage of districts adopting an approach is presented, small districts and large districts count equally, even though more students may be affected if one large district has adopted an approach than if 30 small districts have done the same. Statistically significant differences in adoption rates for districts of various sizes are presented throughout the paper. If no differences are highlighted, an equal proportion of each size district has adopted the approach.

The results presented in this paper reflect the opinions of the superintendents who responded. Respondents were not randomly selected. The results also are limited by the strategies that were included in the survey and the way the questions were asked.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Section 1: Survey Results for New Teacher Support Programs

The first few years of teaching can be a very difficult time, even under the best of circumstances. Most teachers labor in isolation from their colleagues. New teachers often are assigned to some of the most challenging courses and classrooms, sometimes outside their area of training. Add to that the feeling of some new teachers that they have not received enough training to handle certain aspects of their job and these years can be extremely difficult if not impossible for the new teacher to survive (Lewis et al., 1999). The combination of these challenges often drives new teachers disproportionately from the profession.

One response to this situation has been the implementation of programs at the local level to support new teachers. Often called *induction* or *mentoring* programs, support provided to teachers varies but generally is designed to continue or augment the learning process of new teachers. Recruiting New Teachers suggests the following reasons for implementing an induction program (Haselkorn & Fiedler, 1999):

- "To staunch the hemorrhage of new teacher attrition, particularly in our nation's urban schools.
- To eliminate unfit individuals and retain only those who have been deemed competent.
- To extend the preparation period of novice teachers through their crucial first few years upon the job so that they continue to develop as proficient, knowledgeable, and successful teachers of our nation's children.
- To improve the climate for teaching and learning, build community between new and veteran teachers, and, in the process, help address urban teaching's 'brain drain' to the suburbs."

Adoption Rates for New Teacher Support Programs

As Exhibit 3 shows, a majority of districts in the region are providing some level of support to new teachers.

Exhibit 3
Percentage of Districts with New Teacher Support Programs
(Number of Districts)

Illinois*	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisconsin
57.6% (343)	86.8% (184)	43.7% (136)	92.9% (326)	63.9% (177)	90.8% (373)	68.2% (174)

*In Illinois, percentages were 59% (n=116) for elementary districts, 78% (n=36) for secondary districts, and 50% (n=128) for combined districts. Sixty-three Illinois superintendents responding anonymously reported that their district has a new teacher support program.

These new teacher support programs are not evenly distributed across all types of districts. Urban and suburban districts in most NCREL states are more likely to provide a support program than rural districts (see Exhibit 4), and small districts in all seven states are least likely to provide such programs (see Exhibit 5).

Exhibit 4
Percentage of Responding Districts with New Teacher Support Programs by Location
(Number of Districts)

State	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Illinois	68% (17)	73.3% (129)	44.6% (132)
Indiana	100% (19)	90.9% (30)	83.7% (128)
Iowa	87.5% (7)	66.7% (4)	41.8% (120)
Michigan	80% (8)	95.6% (65)	92.8% (232)
Minnesota	80% (4)	88.9% (40)	59.1% (127)
Ohio	82.4% (14)	87.5% (98)	92.1% (234)
Wisconsin	100% (10)	81.6% (31)	62.9% (124)

This exhibit does not include anonymous surveys or those that could not be linked to CCD.

For purposes of this study, locale codes established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) were used to define urban, suburban, and rural. *Urban* is defined as NCES locale codes 1 (Large City) and 2 (Midsize City). *Suburban* is defined as NCES locale codes 3 (Urban Fringe of Large City)

and 5 (Large Town). *Rural* is defined as NCES locale codes 4 (Urban Fringe of Midsize City), 6 (Small Town), and 7 and 8 (Rural). Using NCES codes allowed for a common definition of location across all seven states. (For more information about use of locale codes, see the Methods and Limitations section of this report and the detailed tables in Appendix B.)

Exhibit 5
Percentage of Responding Districts with New Teacher Support Programs by Enrollment Level (Number of Districts)

State	>=10,000	5,000-9,999	1,000-4,999	<1000
Illinois	62.5% (5)	82.6% (19)	70.2% (146)	40.9% (103)
Indiana	100% (13)	96.2% (25)	85.4% (117)	75.9% (22)
Iowa	75% (3)	100% (6)	63.3% (57)	32.3% (65)
Michigan	100% (16)	96.8% (30)	93.5% (186)	88.9% (72)
Minnesota	100% (10)	80% (12)	77.5% (93)	46.1% (53)
Ohio	92.9% (13)	94.1% (32)	91% (244)	84.8% (56)
Wisconsin	100% (5)	100% (11)	81.3% (91)	49.6% (58)

This exhibit does not include anonymous surveys or those that could not be linked to CCD.

Effectiveness of New Teacher Support Programs

New teacher support programs appear to be one of the most valuable tools for reducing teacher attrition, so the number of districts adopting such programs is important. Fifty-two percent of the superintendents in the region who have implemented and rated a new teacher support program reported that the program has been "very successful" in reducing attrition. Only 12 percent rated their program as "not very successful" in reducing attrition. Research conducted on California's New Teachers Project supports these findings; well-designed and well-implemented induction programs reduced teacher-attrition rates by more than two-thirds, and retention rates among minority teachers and in "hard to staff" urban and rural schools also were high (NASBE, 1998). Midwestern superintendents found this provision of support to be an effective tool, not only for improving retention but also for improving recruitment: Forty-seven percent of superintendents who have adopted such programs reported that supporting new teachers is a "very effective" strategy for *recruiting* teachers.

When considering the effectiveness of new teacher support programs as assessed by the survey, it is important to note two things. First, superintendents were asked specifically on this survey to rate the program's effectiveness in retaining and

recruiting teachers. The survey did not address other possible goals of new teacher support programs, such as improving teaching skills. The second important consideration is the age of many new teacher support programs. Many superintendents indicated that their program was too new to judge the effectiveness at reducing attrition (24 percent in the region) and many others left the question blank (19 percent regionally). It is not clear why so many superintendents left the question blank, but one possibility is that they do not know or do not have the data to make such a judgment. Additional time and routine evaluation of more new teacher support programs may be necessary in order to say conclusively that these programs are very effective.

Impact of State-Level Policies

Impact of Policies on Adoption Rates for New Teacher Support Programs

State-level policies have an important impact on adoption rates. As Exhibit 3 indicates, a higher proportion of districts in some states have implemented new teacher support programs. These states have more comprehensive state-level policies either requiring or strongly encouraging support programs. These findings support research conducted by Recruiting New Teachers, which found that "state mandates (but not state funding) often spurred program development" (Haselkorn & Fiedler, 1999).

The states of Indiana and Michigan currently require support for the new teacher. In Ohio, support must be offered by the year 2002. Indiana requires one year of support as part of the teacher-licensing system. The state of Ohio will do the same when its rules take effect in 2002. As of fall 2000, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin provided some state-level funding to encourage districts or groups of districts to develop support programs. Illinois is the only state in the region that does not require or encourage, through financial incentives, its districts to implement such programs. Even without any state-level policies, however, Illinois districts have adopted support programs at a greater rate than Iowa (58 percent, compared to 44 percent) and do not lag too far behind Minnesota (with 64 percent) or Wisconsin (with 68 percent). The impact appears to be the greatest in small and rural districts. In the four states that do not have state level requirements (Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin), small and rural districts are much less likely to have support programs than their urban or suburban counterparts (see Exhibits 4 and 5).

Common Elements of New Teacher Support Programs

State-level policies appear to affect the inclusion of some, but not all, attributes in local support programs. Regardless of state mandates or encouragements, the vast majority of districts that have programs provide one-on-one mentoring. Other attributes also have been widely adopted in all seven states. Seventy-seven percent of the programs in the region also include mentors for new teachers (ranging from a low of 69 percent in Illinois to a high of 83 percent in Ohio). Most programs in the region (77 percent) are mandatory for all new teachers. Again, the range between states is small—from 71 percent in Illinois to 82 percent in Ohio—indicating that state policies have not played an important role in whether or not all new teachers are included. (For additional information, refer to Table 14 in Appendix B.)

Additional Training for Mentors, New Teachers, and Administrators

The inclusion of several program attributes, however, does appear to be affected by state-level policies. Additional training for mentors, new teachers, and administrators is one of these areas. For example, Indiana and Ohio top the region in the percentage of districts that provide training for their mentor teachers. In Indiana, this training is a requirement of districts, resulting in adoption in 61 percent of the state's programs. Under proposed rules taking effect in 2002, Ohio districts will be required to include mentor training; currently the state provides basic training to mentors on state standards for new teachers and has provided funding to pilot programs for this purpose since 1994. Perhaps these provisions are why Ohio leads the region, with 80 percent of its programs training mentors. Illinois programs are least likely to include mentor training; only 39 percent of Illinois districts with programs train their mentors. A majority of districts in three other states (Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota) do not provide mentor training, and in Wisconsin only a slim majority do (52 percent).

Michigan is the only state to formally require that new teachers receive "intensive" professional development or additional training. State law requires programs to provide 15 days of such training in the first three years of teaching. More than 80 percent of Michigan's programs include this attribute, compared to 57 percent of Iowa's programs and the regionwide average of 66 percent.

Indiana is the only state that requires training of principals in how to support new teachers and their mentors. Indiana leads the region in the provision of both types of training. But even in Indiana where such training is required, the vast majority of districts do not include this kind of training in their programs.

Twenty-six percent of Indiana's programs included training for the principal on how to support new teachers, and 16 percent of the programs trained principals on how to support mentors. These figures compare to regional averages of 20 percent for administrator training on new teacher support and 11 percent for mentor support.

Connections of New Teacher Support Programs to State Standards

One way that states have attempted to improve teacher quality is raising their licensure standards for new teachers. In some states, new teachers do not receive full certification until they have successfully completed early years in the classroom. As previously mentioned, a year of new teacher support is included in the teacher-licensure track for Indiana and Ohio. Beginning in 2002, new teachers in Ohio will be required to successfully complete an "Entry Year" program in order to become fully certified. This entry-year program must include a formal program of support including mentoring. Indiana law requires new teachers to successfully complete an "Internship Program" in order to receive full licensure. Given these requirements for teacher certification, it is not surprising that 55 percent of Ohio's programs and 42 percent of Indiana's programs are linked to state standards for teachers. Michigan's "probationary" teachers must complete an "Individualized Development Plan," part of which can be fulfilled by new teacher support activities (particularly the 15 days of required staff development). Forty-three percent of Michigan's programs report a connection to state standards for teachers. Iowa's programs are least likely to be connected (10 percent).

Support for Mentors

Support for the mentor can sometimes be forgotten when programs are designed to support new teachers. Such support may be an important element in enticing good, veteran teachers to take on the additional responsibilities associated with being a mentor. Indiana and Ohio were most likely to provide release time and compensation for mentors. State funding of $600 per mentor is available in Indiana, where 76 percent of the programs compensate their mentor teachers. Ohio has equally high levels of mentor compensation at 71.8 percent. These figures compare with a low of 34 percent in Illinois and a regional average of 53 percent. Although Ohio does not currently provide statewide funding for mentor compensation, the state has provided grants to pilot projects for the past seven years. These grants have been used to train mentor teachers and compensate them. The state of Ohio also has placed a great deal of emphasis on beginning teachers

and their support by requiring new teachers to pass the performance-based PRAXIS III test in order to become fully certified. With this requirement taking effect in 2002, Ohio districts are taking seriously the need to implement a high-quality new teacher support program that will result in teachers passing this exam. It is widely believed that a high-quality program attracts excellent mentors by paying them.

It also is believed that a high-quality support program provides mentors with the time they need to do a good job. Release time—which allows the mentor to prepare material, receive training, and spend time with the new teacher—is encouraged in Indiana, resulting in adoption in 59 percent of that state's programs. Ohio ranked second in the region with 47 percent. Illinois, the state with no state-level programs, had the lowest percentage of programs with release time at 22 percent. The region average was 34 percent.

Table 14 in Appendix B details adoption rates for all attributes included in the survey by state.

Attributes of Successful New Teacher Support Programs

The attributes of a program are likely to have some impact on the effectiveness of that program. It is widely believed that more comprehensive programs, which include many or all of the attributes included in this survey, are more likely to be successful (NASBE, 1998). The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (cited in NASBE, 1998), for example, suggests that the following seven components are essential for a new teacher support system:

- "A focus on beginning teachers—with attention also given to school and systemic improvement.
- Mentor teachers to work with beginning teachers throughout the year.
- A training component for mentor teachers or support teams.
- An in-service program based on needs determined by both the beginning and mentor teachers.
- Additional funding from the state or district that is earmarked for supporting new teachers.
- A process to assess new teachers.
- A process to evaluate the effectiveness of the support

system and to determine needed changes." (p. 32)

Survey results point to some attributes that are less often adopted in the region but may be important to success. In a comparison of those programs rated by superintendents as "very effective" and those rated as "not very effective," a few differences emerge. Programs rated as "very effective" were more likely to have adequate funding for all interested teachers ($p = .008$), to provide additional training or professional development for new teachers ($p = .000$), and to include training for administrators on how to support new teachers ($p = .010$) and new mentors ($p = .041$). (Table 14 and Table 15 in Appendix B show a full comparison for all attributes.)

Superintendents with new teacher support programs were asked to select the three attributes they felt were most important for a successful program. The attributes selected most often in the region (and in all seven states) were one-on-one mentoring (66 percent), mandatory training for all new teachers (62 percent), training for the new teacher (44 percent), training for the mentor teacher (34 percent), adequate funding (20 percent), and mentor compensation (19 percent). Three-quarters of programs in the region currently include mentoring and are mandatory. One-third of the region's programs do not include training for the new teacher, and nearly half of the programs do not include training or compensation for mentors. Less than half of the region's districts with a new teacher support program report that there is adequate funding to include all new teachers. Recruiting New Teachers' research on urban induction programs found that "one in three [urban] programs has reluctantly cut back services due to insufficient resources" (Haselkorn & Fiedler, 1999).

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Section 2: Survey Results for Other Retention Strategies

In addition to new teacher support programs, districts have adopted a wide variety of other measures that are believed to reduce the attrition of high-quality teachers. These measures, some of which are included in Exhibit 6, revolve around the broad themes of improving the professionalism of teaching, improving working conditions, and improving the compensation of teaching. Exhibit 6 outlines those strategies included in the survey that were *most often adopted* in the region. (Not all strategies included in the survey are presented in this exhibit.)

Exhibit 6
Percentage and Number of Responding Districts That Have Used Each Strategy for Retaining Teachers

Strategy	IL	IN	IA	MI	MN	OH	WI	Region
Schedule changes for common planning time	46.3% (276)	56.1% (119)	44.7% (139)	59.4% (208)	46.2% (128)	62.8% (258)	68.6% (175)	54% (1303)
Team or interdisciplinary teaching	42.6% (254)	51.4% (109)	40.5% (126)	55.7% (195)	41.2% (114)	52.8% (217)	45.9% (117)	46.9% (1132)
Increased compensation for all teachers	54.2% (323)	49.1% (104)	44.4% (138)	48.6% (170)	57% (158)	56.4% (232)	31.8% (81)	50% (1206)
Involvement of teachers in decision making	75% (447)	75% (159)	80.1% (249)	80% (280)	69.3% (192)	78.8% (324)	78.4% (200)	76.7% (1851)
Improved staff development (other than new teacher support)	70.3% (419)	79.2% (168)	69.1% (215)	73.7% (258)	62.5% (173)	74.9% (308)	64.3% (164)	70.7% (1705)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As this exhibit shows, states in the NCREL region have varying adoption rates for these strategies, particularly in the areas of increasing compensation for all teachers and common planning time.

Compensation Reform

Several approaches that have been advocated for on a national level (Darling-Hammond, 1997) have not been widely adopted in the region. Among these approaches are those relating to compensation reform. They include changes to the compensation system that would reward teachers for skills and knowledge, for success with students, and for a school's success; and that would create new career ladders for teachers involving greater responsibility for increased compensation (Allen & Palaich, 2000; Milken, 2000; Odden, 2000).

Each of these compensation-reform approaches has been adopted by fewer than 6 percent of the districts in the region. The districts that have adopted such approaches are likely those included in the Teacher Union Reform Network—a network of American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association local affiliates. This network is dedicated to the premise that "quality of instruction in all schools can be reinforced by new approaches to teacher compensation" (Urbanski & Erskine, 2000, p. 367). Regional districts involved in this network include Cincinnati and Columbus, Ohio; Hammond, Indiana; and Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Allen Odden, director of the Teacher Compensation Project of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin, contends that the steps and lanes of the current salary schedule are so resilient that they are the "DNA of teacher pay." He states:

> "One reason for the dismal history of changes in how teachers are paid is that nearly all past proposals offered some version of merit pay.... They have floundered in part because teachers are uncomfortable with differentiation of pay based on subjective judgments of administrators and in part because of a lack of continued funding." (Odden, 2000, p. 361)

This opinion is backed up by Public Agenda's recent survey of teachers, which found that a majority of teachers polled do not believe it is effective to tie teacher rewards and sanctions to student performance (Farkas, Johnson, & Foleno, 2000).

Odden, however, argues that important changes have taken place and these changes pave the way for more districts to adopt "pay for performance" approaches. Among these changes is the recommendation of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future that teacher salary structures should provide pay

increases on the basis of teachers' knowledge and skills as well as offer incentives for improved performance (Darling-Hammond, 1997). In addition, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was established to develop national criteria for certifying "accomplished" teachers.

Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future has strongly endorsed the certification of teachers by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Although support for this certification process is not universal (Podgursky, 2001), such certification is seen as a means to improve the skills and knowledge of teachers, to increase the professionalism of teaching, and to identify the most accomplished teachers—and, in the process, keep more good teachers in the profession. States and individual districts across the country have developed programs to encourage and support teachers as they become certified by the National Board. According to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2001), all seven states in the NCREL region provide financial assistance with certification fees for teachers. In addition, three states in the region—Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin—provide an annual stipend of $2,500 to teachers who receive Board certification for the 10-year life of the National Board Certificate. Illinois provides a one-time stipend of $3,000.

Local school districts throughout the region also provide some level of support and/or encouragement for teachers seeking to be certified by the National Board. For example, Anderson School District in Anderson, Indiana, provides five days of release time to its candidates for portfolio preparation. In the Grand Rapids, Michigan, school district, National Board candidates receive two days of release time and a $5,000 stipend when they successfully complete the process. Local districts often pay these teachers more by moving them up the salary scale or providing defined annual stipends of $500 to $5,000 (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2001).

The percentage of districts providing this kind of support varies throughout the Midwest. Ohio leads the region with 34 percent of its districts offering support—compared to Michigan, where only 8 percent of the state's districts do so. Ohio is one of three states in the region that is a partner state of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Indiana and Illinois, the other two states, have a smaller proportion of districts providing support—15 percent and 16 percent, respectively.

Differences in Adoption Rates for Successful Retention Strategies

Adoption rates for some retention strategies varied depending upon certain characteristics of the districts. Statistically significant differences are outlined in Exhibit 7. To the extent that these strategies are effective (as discussed in the following section), these differences can be important. Although this exhibit presents regional analyses, the statements included are accurate for most of the states (at least six) individually as well.

Exhibit 7
Differences in Adoption of Strategies by District Characteristics
(all differences are statistically significant at the .05 level)

Strategy	Differences in Adoption Rates
Common planning time	Small districts (enrollment < 1000) are less likely to have adopted this strategy than districts with enrollments greater than 1,000 (42% for small districts, compared to 61% for the largest).
Team or interdisciplinary teaching	Small districts (enrollment < 1000) are less likely to have adopted this strategy than districts with enrollments greater than 1,000 (33% for small districts, compared to 63% for the largest). Rural districts are less likely to have adopted this strategy than suburban or urban districts (42% for rural districts, compared to 60% for suburban and 62% for urban).
Increased compensation for all teachers	The wealthiest districts (fewer than 10% of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches) are most likely to have increased all salaries (57% of the wealthiest districts, compared to 44% of the poorest).
Recruitment from and training in the local community	The poorest districts (those with a majority of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches) were more likely to have adopted this strategy (39% of the poorest districts, compared to 23% of the wealthiest districts). Urban districts are more likely than suburban or rural districts to have adopted this approach (37% of urban districts, compared to 24% of suburban and 29% of rural districts).
Support for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification	The largest districts (enrollment > 10,000) were more likely to have provided support than smaller districts (< 1,000) (40% of the largest districts, compared to 12% for the smallest districts). Urban districts are more likely to have provided support than rural or suburban districts (39% of urban districts, compared to 25% of suburban districts and 14% of rural districts).

Effectiveness of Retention Strategies

Superintendents were asked to rate the strategies that they have implemented. They used a scale of "very successful," "moderately successful," or "not very successful," indicating how effective the strategy has been at reducing the attrition of high-quality teachers. It is important to note that superintendents were asked to rate the strategy based on retention; therefore, the effectiveness ratings included in this report do not speak to other possible positive impacts of the listed strategies.

Most of the strategies included in the survey were rated as at least moderately successful. Exhibit 8 lists the most promising strategies. The majority of superintendents in the districts that have adopted these strategies rated them as "very successful."

Exhibit 8
Most Promising Retention Strategies as Rated by Implementing Districts

Strategy	Percentage Rating Strategy		
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful
Restructuring schools to make them smaller	54.6%	44.1%	1.3%
Involving teachers in decision making	51.8%	45.0%	3.2%
Recruiting from and training in the community	51.6%	45.1%	3.3%
Implementing common planning time	51.4%	46.3%	2.3%

Two other strategies were not far behind. Implementing team or interdisciplinary teaching was rated "very successful" by 47 percent of superintendents who have adopted the practice, and improving staff development received the same rating from 44.6 percent of adopting superintendents. (Tables in Appendix B provide results for individual states in the region.)

Highly Effective Approaches That Are Lower Cost

Greater Collaboration Between Teachers

Among the most successful retention strategies are three approaches designed to improve the working conditions of teachers and treat teachers more as professionals. Implementing common planning time and implementing team or interdisciplinary teaching are measures that reduce the isolation of individual teachers and increase collaboration. These strategies, along with involvement of teachers in decision making, may require significant changes in the way a school operates,

but they do not have to be accompanied by large price tags. Appropriate implementation may involve some up-front costs and allocation of staff development funds, however. As previously mentioned, small and rural districts are less likely to have implemented these effective measures.

In addition to the retention benefits claimed by superintendents, collaboration among teachers can result in improved teaching. According to the U.S. Department of Education, teachers and researchers alike say that collaborative professional development—such as common planning periods, team teaching, and regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers and administrators—is more effective than other forms (Lewis et al., 1999). Through collaboration, weak teachers can be assisted by stronger ones. Teachers can share techniques and information. Curriculum can be better coordinated and aligned so that student learning is improved. Understanding of individual student needs can be improved as multiple perspectives on one student are shared.

Involving Teachers in Decisions

Involving teachers in decision making also can have multiple benefits. Implementation of this strategy not only results in fewer teachers leaving (according to NCREL region superintendents) but also improves the relationship between administrators and teachers, improves the decisions that are made, and increases the likelihood that decisions made will be feasible and well implemented in the classroom.

Superintendent responses are backed up by other research (Johnson, 1990; Sclan, 1993). The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) (1998) summarizes the research as follows:

> "The manner in which schools organize teachers' and students' work has clear and direct impact on teachers' decisions to leave or stay in the field. When teachers feel supported and have more opportunity for collaboration, more say in important educational decisions, and greater flexibility in how they teach, and when they feel less isolated from their peers and more included as members of learning communities, they tend to be more committed to their jobs and more likely to stay in teaching." (p. 23)

Small Schools

The top-rated retention strategy is restructuring schools to make them smaller. Unfortunately, this strategy has been implemented in only 14 percent of the region's districts. A large body of research documents the many benefits of smaller schools. These benefits include increased safety, improved academic achievement, and higher attendance and

graduation rates (Bryk, 1994; Howley & Bikel, 2000; Lee & Smith, 1993; Pittman & Haughwout, 1987; Raywid, 1996). For example, Anthony Bryk, of the Center for School Improvement at the University of Chicago, recently analyzed a number of studies about the relationship between high school size, cost, and quality. Bryk (1994) found:

> "Based on a large representative national sample, ... smaller high schools are more engaging environments and produce greater gains in student achievement. These findings complement and extend a now-large body of research evidence that smaller schools are more productive workplaces for both adults and students. In these more intimate environments, teachers are more likely to report greater satisfaction with their work, higher levels of morale, and greater commitment. Problems of student misconduct, class cutting, absenteeism, and dropping out are all less prevalent." (p. 7)

Survey results support the notion that when districts restructure their schools to make them smaller, more high-quality teachers stay in that district. Restructuring schools to make them smaller may result in an improved environment for teaching for the reasons cited by Bryk (1994) and others. For example, in the Chicago Public Schools system, an effort to improve student achievement spurred a movement to create smaller schools within big schools; in addition to improved achievement, this system has found that the new small schools created out of large schools have increased cooperation among teachers and have involved teachers more in the process of educational reform (Joravsky, 2000). In a small school environment with teachers as the primary agents of change, students are likely to achieve better results (Joravsky, 2000).

"Grow Your Own" Teachers

Another very successful retention strategy—recruiting from and training in the community—appears in only 28 percent of the districts, although low-wealth districts and urban districts have made use of this strategy at higher rates (38 percent and 37 percent respectively). Low-wealth, urban, and rural school districts often have difficulty attracting new teachers to their schools and keeping them there after they come. These districts often complain that they expend time and resources developing new teachers, only to see them leave in response to more lucrative offers in other districts or other careers.

One response to this situation has been the "grow your own" teachers strategy, which was called a "promising alternative" by the U.S. Department of Education Initiative on Teaching (2000). Under this strategy, for example, a school district might provide employees—such as paraprofessionals, substitute teachers, secretaries, custodians who

have exemplary work records and a commitment to teaching—tuition and other support to complete a teaching degree. Parent volunteers also might be included in such a program. Some urban districts, such as the Chicago Public Schools, have established relationships with a small number of teacher-training institutions in their community to train local people interested in becoming teachers. The design of a "grow your own" program may vary based on location and size of a district, but in general the rationale for this approach is that it is easier to keep people who have deep roots in the community. A paraprofessional or parent who already has demonstrated a commitment to a school district or a community is more likely to stay with a school if an investment is made in his or her professional development or training.

According to the U.S. Department of Education Initiative on Teaching (2000), a study of the "grow your own" program implemented in the Savannah/Chatham County Schools in Georgia showed that this approach can create exemplary teachers; 24 of 60 graduates were named Teacher of the Year at their school. Such programs also can keep teachers from leaving the profession; 96 percent of the graduates who accepted teaching positions in the Savannah/Chatham County Schools stayed in teaching.

The experience of regional superintendents confirms positive results found in other studies. A majority of the superintendents who have implemented this approach rate it "very successful." As Exhibit 7 indicates, low-wealth and urban districts are more likely to adopt this approach, usually for the reasons cited above.

Other Approaches to Improved Retention

Compensation

Increasing teacher salaries to competitive levels often is advanced as a key component of any plan to attract teachers to the profession and keep them from leaving for other career options. In its annual report on teacher salaries, the American Federation of Teachers compares teacher salaries to other professions requiring similar education and skills; in these comparisons, salary levels for the teaching profession do not compare well (Nelson, Drown, & Gould, 2000). In fact, comparisons of starting salaries for teachers are significantly lower than starting salaries in comparable professions (Nelson, Drown, & Gould, 2000). Some argue, however, that these comparisons do not account for the current nine- to ten-month contract under which most teachers operate. In addition, salary levels used for comparisons by the American Federation of Teachers (and by many others) do not usually include other forms of compensation that teachers receive for extracurricular work, for staying with the district a certain period of time, for not calling in sick, and for other extra duties or incentives.

This issue is complicated. A combination of factors is likely to affect

the way an individual teacher views salary issues. These factors might include the absolute level of salaries, the determination of salary levels and increases, the overall employment market, the teaching environment, and personal goals. An examination of teacher attitudes conducted by Public Agenda, for example, found that teachers prefer working in schools with better behaved students, supportive parents, highly motivated teachers, and supportive administrators rather than working in schools that pay significantly more but do not have the positive environment (Farkas, Johnson, & Foleno, 2000). Although opinion polls show that taxpayers would like teachers to be paid more (Haselkorn & Harris, 1998), resources available to schools have not increased enough to raise salaries to "competitive" levels across the profession. Given the current structure of K-12 education and limits on resources, it is unlikely that increased teacher salaries will occur in the near future. Many school districts, however, have made the choice to increase salary levels at a rate higher than increases in revenue. The result in some districts has been cuts in programming, a reduction in the number of teachers, and increases in class sizes.

The retention strategy of increasing salaries for all teachers was viewed as "moderately successful" by 57 percent of the 1,206 superintendents who have tried this approach. Only 36 percent rated this strategy as "very successful." The effectiveness of this approach could be heavily impacted by how salary levels both before and after salary increases compare to other districts or other potential employers. In other words, if the salary levels of a small rural district are very low relative to other districts in the state and if that small rural district makes a large commitment to salary increases, salary levels at the end of this process still may not be competitive. The same situation may be true for a district that already has high salary levels; further increases may not have much of an impact.

A very simplistic analysis of average salary levels in a state and the proportion of districts in a state having difficulty retaining teachers reveals some correlation at the top and bottom. This simplistic comparison leaves out many other factors that may play an equally important role in the number of districts that are having difficulty retaining teachers. Michigan, the state with the lowest proportion of districts having difficulty retaining teachers (21.9 percent) also is the state with the highest average salaries in the region. In fact, after adjustments for cost-of-living expenses, Michigan has the highest teacher salaries in the nation (Nelson, Drown, & Gould, 2000). At the other extreme, Iowa has the lowest average salaries in the region; it is ranked 27th in the nation when adjusted for cost-of-living expenses, according to Nelson, Drown, and Gould (2000), and has the highest proportion of districts having difficulty retaining teachers (44 percent according to survey results). In between these two extremes, the patterns are not so clear.

Another issue is the relationship between beginning teacher salaries

and average teacher salaries. In 1998-99, these salaries ranged from $23,087 in Ohio to $28,954 in Illinois. Research conducted by the Center for School Change (1999) showed that average salary increases in Minnesota masked the fact that beginning teachers received much lower annual salary increases than more experienced teachers; in some districts, this difference was as large as 8 percent at the low end of service compared to 24 percent at the high end. Districts in several states in the region appear to have recognized this problem. Nelson, Drown, and Gould (2000) report that average increases in Iowa's beginning salaries in 1998-99 were 8.2 percent, compared to increases of 2.7 percent for average teacher salaries in Iowa. In Minnesota, increases of 7.7 percent on average went to beginning teachers, compared to the average teacher salary increase of 4.3 percent. Illinois and Ohio are the only states in the region where beginning salary increases did not outpace or equal average salary increases in 1998-99 (Nelson, Drown, & Gould, 2000).

The region's superintendents found the strategy of increasing beginning teacher salaries to be marginally more effective than raising all salaries. Forty-one percent rated this approach "very successful." Approximately 20 percent of the superintendents reported that they were focusing on beginning salaries by increasing these salaries without increasing all salaries.

A third set of issues revolves around how beginning salaries and increases in salaries are determined. The current system is one that financially rewards teachers for academic degrees and time in the profession. This approach does not reward teachers for performance or demonstrated skills or for taking on leadership roles among fellow teachers. As discussed earlier, a small number of districts in the region have implemented reforms to the compensation system designed to address these concerns. The successfulness of these approaches at retaining high-quality teachers is moderate, according to superintendents in the few districts that have attempted such changes. In fact, these approaches garnered some of the highest "not very successful" ratings of all the strategies presented (in the range of 16 percent to 28 percent). Failure of these approaches may relate to how they are designed, as Odden (2000) suggests. It also is important to note that the number of districts implementing teacher-compensation reforms is very small—for some strategies, less than 50 for the entire region. In consequence, the reliability of these numbers may be suspect because they may give an inaccurate portrayal of the situation. (Table 18 in Appendix B details response rates by state for each strategy.)

The current compensation system also does not account very well for experiences in fields other than teaching. For example, it does not allow someone to make a midcareer change to teaching without a significant financial penalty. Also, it does not provide the flexibility that might be necessary to respond to the market—for example, allowing a

district to pay a high-demand science or special education teacher more than a general third-grade elementary teacher. (These issues are further examined in the section on Survey Results for Recruitment Strategies.)

Improved Staff Development

Making an investment in staff development is one of the most cost-effective measures a school district can take to improve student achievement (Greenwall, Hedges, & Laine, 1996; Harris, 2000). High-quality staff development can be an important element in keeping teachers and improving the quality of teachers. Forty-four percent of the superintendents in the region who have adopted this strategy found improved staff development to be a very successful approach for keeping high-quality teachers in their classrooms. This approach was rated "very effective" by slightly fewer adopting superintendents than the strategies of smaller schools, shared decision-making, and greater collaboration among teachers. Common criticisms of current staff development programs include inadequate funding, insufficient time, and lack of results-driven professional development (U.S. Department of Education Initiative on Teaching, 2000).

Efforts to improve professional development might include some of the "promising alternatives" recommended by the U.S. Department of Education Initiative on Teaching (2000):

- Committing more resources to staff development.
- Creating job-embedded, collaborative, content-focused professional development opportunities that are sustained throughout the school year.
- Implementing year-round contracts for teachers to provide extra time for professional development, curriculum planning, and collaboration to improve student learning.
- Restructuring the school schedule to provide longer, uninterrupted planning time for teachers.
- Providing summer institutes that allow teachers to "recharge their intellectual batteries."
- Evaluating professional development based on improving teaching, improving student learning, and narrowing student achievement gaps.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org

Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Section 3: Survey Results for Recruitment Strategies

To ensure a high-quality teacher in every classroom, the region's school districts need both to retain high-quality teachers and to attract them. Efforts to recruit teachers included in the survey are less widespread than efforts to retain teachers. Only three of the recruitment strategies included in the survey have been adopted by a majority of the region's districts. The most commonly identified strategies include offering support to beginning teachers, hiring under temporary licenses, and aggressively recruiting from teacher-preparation institutions. (Adoption of programs to support new teachers as both a recruitment strategy and a retention strategy is covered extensively in an earlier section of this report. Table 23 in Appendix B details adoption rates for all strategies by state.)

Temporary Licenses

Hiring under temporary licenses often is viewed as a proxy for teacher shortages and teacher quality in a state. It typically is assumed that teachers hired under a temporary license are less effective than teachers who are fully certified or licensed to teach and that if a fully qualified individual were available, he or she would have been hired instead. Although research indicates that unqualified teachers are less effective in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2000), a variety of factors may lead a district to fill an open position using temporary licensure.

Exhibit 9
Percentage and Number of Responding Districts That Report Hiring Teachers Under Temporary Licenses

IL	IN	IA	MI	MN	OH	WI	Region
39.3% (234)	67.9% (144)	70.1% (218)	50.9% (178)	70.8% (196)	58.2% (239)	71% (181)	57.6% (1390)

As Exhibit 9 shows, use of this approach is widespread in the region. Nearly 58 percent of the districts regionwide report hiring

teachers under temporary licenses. Use, however, does vary considerably by state, from a high of 71 percent in Wisconsin to a low of 39 percent in Illinois. Across the region, the largest districts and the poorest districts are more likely to make use of this strategy. Seventy-four percent of districts with more than 10,000 students made use of this approach, compared to 58 percent of districts with less than 1,000 students (p=.001). Teachers were hired under temporary license in 61 percent of the region's poorest districts (in which the majority of students receive free or reduced-price lunch) and in 45 percent of the region's high-wealth districts (in which less than 10 percent of students receive free or reduced-price lunch) (p=.000).

Connections With Teacher-Preparation Programs

A majority of districts across the region have aggressively recruited new teachers from teacher-preparation institutions. College and universities that train teachers often hold employment fairs and other events, giving school districts an opportunity to court prospective teachers. Districts also have engaged in creative approaches. For example, one district in Georgia invites about 30 college placement directors to visit the district for two days; during the visit, placement directors are bused around to schools, meet administrators, talk with teachers who have graduated from their program, and are treated to a special event (Grant, 2001). In addition to such strategies, school districts actively recruit through phone calls, e-mail, and flyers directed to college and university deans, department chairs, and student services offices. More than 1,200 school districts in the region—ranging from 44 percent of districts in Wisconsin to 58 percent in Michigan—report engaging in activities of this sort.

Exhibit 10 illustrates that recruitment at colleges and universities is almost twice as likely to be undertaken by urban and large school districts (in which enrollment is greater than 10,000 students) than by small and rural districts. Small and rural districts may be hiring only a few teachers, compared to some large and urban districts that must find a hundred or more teachers to fill their classrooms at any time. Given the number of teachers being hired, aggressive recruitment efforts may be too costly in terms of time and resources to make such efforts worthwhile for smaller districts.

Exhibit 10
Connections to Teacher-Preparation Programs as Reported by Responding Districts of Each Type

	District Type			
Strategy	**Urban**	**Rural**	**Large (More than10,000**	**Small (Less than 1,000**

			students)	students)
Aggressive recruitment from teacher-preparation institutions	80%	48%	87%	42%
Establishment of school-university partnerships	56%	14%	51%	10%

p = .000 for all comparisons.

Establishment of school-university partnerships—another recruitment strategy included in the survey—also is less likely to happen in small and rural districts. This situation may be related to the reduced proximity of teacher-preparation institutions to school districts in rural areas or the lesser availability of faculty and other resources at teacher-preparation institutions located in more remote areas. A large urban area may have five or six teacher-preparation institutions and one or two school districts. By comparison, a rural region of a state may have one preparation institution and more than ten school districts.

These relationships are important to the quality of teaching for two reasons. First, such partnerships can serve to funnel high-quality new teachers into a school district. Under such partnerships, prospective teachers may spend time in a district's schools getting hands-on experience through observations, internships, student teaching, and other avenues. Schools can identify particularly promising teachers through these mechanisms, and new teachers have an opportunity to develop relationships and familiarity with a school and district. If well designed, partnerships of this nature can give the prospective teacher a positive feeling about teaching in that district.

Second, well-structured school-university partnerships that provide students meaningful contact with exceptional teachers and schools also can be an important mechanism for improving teacher preparation. Frequent criticisms of current teacher-preparation programs are that they do not include enough field experience and that faculty members are too disconnected from K-12 classrooms. Good partnerships can address both of these concerns. Researchers such as Fleener (1999) and Mantle-Bromley, Gould, McWhorter, and Whaley (2000) have reported that graduates involved in clinical experiences in school settings experience higher job satisfaction and remain in teaching in greater numbers during their early years than those trained in traditional programs.

It is important to note, however, that placing prospective teachers in classrooms with weak teachers is not likely to serve either the

preparation program or the district. In other words, a poorly designed partnership that does not carefully construct meaningful contact between K-12 schools and preparation programs can leave a prospective teacher with negative feelings about the district (and perhaps teaching in general) and will not improve that teacher's skills.

Effectiveness of Recruitment Mechanisms

In general, recruitment strategies were not rated "very effective" as often as retention strategies. The most common response for all recruitment strategies included in the survey was "moderately successful." Several strategies, however, were rated "very successful" by close to a majority of superintendents who have implemented the strategy. These strategies are listed in Exhibit 11.

Exhibit 11
Most Successful Recruitment Strategies as Rated by Districts Using the Strategy

Strategy	Percentage Rating "Very Successful"
Placing high-demand teachers above entry on the salary scale	59%
Aggressively recruiting from teacher-preparation institutions	49%
Retraining current staff	47%
Offering support to beginning teachers	47%
Providing salary schedule credit for higher ed experience	46%
Providing salary schedule credit for nonteaching experience	44%

Flexibility in Compensation for New Teachers

Three of the top-rated recruitment strategies involve more flexible use of the established salary schedule in order to pay some individuals more money. As discussed earlier, salary schedules usually are developed under the assumption that a teacher with more education and more years of experience earns a higher salary and that all teachers regardless of other factors (such as subject taught) receive the same salary based on these criteria.

The first of these strategies is placing new teachers in high-demand subjects above the entry level on the salary scale. This approach allows superintendents to respond to the marketplace. Use of this strategy would allow a new science teacher, for example, to be paid more than a new elementary teacher, even though they might be at the same level on the salary schedule based on the academic

degrees they hold and the number of years they have been teaching. A superintendent also may increase a salary offer for a desirable individual by giving her or him "credit" on the salary scale for professional experiences outside of teaching or higher education teaching experience. In some cases, these actions may be in violation of contract agreements with teachers unions, which generally govern the particulars of a salary schedule.

Use of these approaches varies to some extent across the region. As Exhibit 12 shows, the three states that make the most use of these flexible compensation mechanisms are Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Indiana is least likely to use them. In general, these successful recruitment approaches have not been widely used in the region. Only a small proportion of the region's districts have taken these steps to attract teachers, perhaps because of local contract agreements with teachers unions.

Exhibit 12
Flexible Use of Salary Schedules by Responding Districts

Strategy	IL	IN	IA	MI	MN	OH	WI	Region
Salary credit for nonteaching experience	17.3% (103)	11.3% (24)	17.4% (54)	21.4% (75)	33.2% (92)	12.4% (51)	29.8% (76)	19.7% (475)
Salary credit for higher ed experience	16.1% (96)	11.3% (24)	17.7% (55)	14.9% (52)	22% (61)	19.2% (79)	19.2% (49)	17.2% (416)
High-demand teachers above entry in salary	18% (56)	12.8% (76)	2.8% (6)	29.1% (102)	35.4% (98)	12.2% (50)	33.7% (86)	19.7% (474)

Other Successful Strategies for Attracting Teachers

One promising strategy that has been advanced for districts having difficulty recruiting staff, particularly in shortage areas, is to retrain current staff. The idea is to take good teachers in a surplus area—such as elementary education or social studies—and support their efforts financially (and otherwise) to become certified to teach in shortage areas—such as science or special education. Although this approach was rated "very successful" by 47 percent of superintendents, only 22 percent of districts have engaged in it regionally. Retraining of current staff was practiced in 23 percent of rural districts, compared to 17 percent of urban districts and 9 percent of suburban districts.

Providing support for new teachers has been discussed extensively in previous sections of this report. To reiterate, this strategy was viewed as successful in both retaining *and* attracting teachers. It is not surprising that a new teacher would find a strong support program appealing and that the type of support offered might influence career decisions.

Connections to teacher-preparation programs rated fairly high among implementers. Forty-nine percent of superintendents or 589 districts reported that this strategy has been "very successful" in attracting new high-quality teachers. Similarly, 43 percent of superintendents believed that their school-university partnerships have been a "very successful" recruitment tool. Both approaches, however, are much less likely to occur in small or rural districts.

Other Recruitment Approaches

The training of paraprofessionals is similar to the "grow your own" approach. Some districts, particularly in urban areas, have assisted promising paraprofessionals to become certified to teach. This approach has been suggested to boost the number of teachers of color in urban schools. Thirty-four percent of the region's urban districts have attempted this strategy (compared to 19 percent of suburban and rural districts) and 37 percent of all adopters in the region rated this strategy "very successful."

Although many districts have engaged in hiring teachers under temporary licenses, superintendents using this approach find it to be less effective than other recruitment strategies included in the survey. More than half the superintendents (59 percent) found this strategy to be "moderately successful." It is interesting to note, however, that 36 percent of superintendents rated this approach "very successful" in recruiting *high-quality* teachers. Assumptions about the quality of these recruits may need to be further examined. Perhaps some of these teachers have assets that are not adequately accounted for, given current criteria (such as formal education) for making such judgments. Some teachers with temporary licenses, no doubt, are high-quality teachers who come from other states or countries and need to update their credentials. Others may be gifted educators with experience in other professions, perhaps midcareer shifters who lack some of the formal coursework necessary to become fully certified. Understanding more about the individuals hired under these kinds of licenses might be important for judging the value of this measure as a proxy for teacher quality and teacher shortages.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org

Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Conclusions

Survey results lead to several overarching conclusions. Retention of high-quality teachers remains a problem for a large number of school districts in the Midwest. Although retention is a bigger problem for rural and urban schools, suburban schools are not immune. Retention of teachers is important because most of the teachers leaving are regarded as effective. A majority of superintendents in all seven states indicated that 75 percent to 100 percent of the teachers leaving are "very effective" or "effective" in the classroom. Fortunately, districts throughout the region have implemented successful strategies for retaining and recruiting teachers. The most effective of these strategies include support programs for new teachers, smaller schools, more collaboration and involvement of teachers, flexible use of the salary schedule, "growing your own" teachers, and partnerships between teacher-preparation programs and school districts. Offering support to new teachers is one approach that was rated effective in both attracting and retaining teachers. In general, the recruitment strategies included in the survey were not rated as effective as many of the retention strategies. The most common rating for all but two recruitment strategies was "moderately effective."

This research shows that recruitment, but especially retention, of high-quality teachers can be enhanced by actions of school and state leaders. Many of these actions can be taken without significant new resources. Additional research can provide more details on the specifics of how these approaches have been implemented at the local level and encouraged at the state level, but action should not wait for such research. The evidence presented in this report shows that many districts are taking effective steps to make sure that their classrooms are filled with high-quality teachers. All students should receive the significant benefits of being taught by a high-quality teacher.

Conclusions Relating to New Teacher Support Programs

Superintendent responses led to the following conclusions

about new teacher support programs:

- In general, new teacher support programs are rated as an effective retention strategy. A majority of those districts rating the programs rated their program as "very effective." Many districts, however, reported that their program was too new to judge the effectiveness (24 percent), and many others did not respond to this question (19 percent).

- More comprehensive new teacher support programs do appear to be more effective. Programs rated as "very effective" were more likely to have adequate funding for all interested teachers ($p=.008$), provide additional training or professional development for new teachers ($p = .000$), and include training for administrators on how to support new teachers ($p = .010$) and new mentors ($p = .041$) than programs rated as "not very effective."

- The vast majority of new teacher support programs implemented in the region include the two attributes viewed as most important for success: one-on-one mentoring, and mandatory participation for all new teachers.

- States without state-level requirements for new teacher support programs have fewer programs, particularly in rural districts. These programs are less comprehensive on average and include fewer components.

Conclusions Relating to Effective Retention Strategies

Superintendent responses led to the following conclusions about effective retention strategies:

- Three lower-cost strategies that improve the professionalism of teaching were rated as effective or more effective than strategies such as increasing teacher salaries. These strategies are involving teachers in decision making, implementing team or interdisciplinary teaching, and making scheduling changes to allow common planning time for teachers.

- Restructuring schools to make them smaller—the strategy rated very effective by the largest proportion of districts using the strategy—has not been widely implemented across the region.

- Recruiting from and training in the community is an effective strategy that is most frequently adopted by low-

wealth districts but not widely adopted overall.

- Many strategies rated as very effective are less likely to have been adopted by small or rural districts. Large or urban districts, however, are more likely to have adopted many of these strategies.

- Many of the effectively rated retention policies—such as improved staff development—are known to have additional benefits. This strategy, for example, also can have an important impact on teaching skills.

- Increasing salaries for beginning teachers is ranked slightly more effective than increasing salaries for all teachers. The vast majority of districts increasing salaries for all teachers, however, rated this approach as "moderately successful."

Conclusions Relating to Effective Recruitment Strategies

Superintendent responses led to the following conclusions about effective recruitment strategies:

- Three of the most highly rated recruitment mechanisms involve manipulation of salary schedules to increase salary levels for a particular individual.

- Aggressive recruitment at institutions of higher education and school-university partnerships are effective approaches that are much more likely to occur at urban and large districts than at small or rural districts.

- Increased connections between colleges of education and school districts not only are effective recruitment measures but also have the potential to improve the quality of teacher preparation. Improved teacher preparation also is believed to be an important element in reducing teacher attrition.

- Retraining current staff is an effective strategy that most often is used in rural districts.

- Although one of the most often used strategies is hiring teachers under temporary license, its effectiveness is rated relatively lower than other recruitment strategies included in the survey.

The data set generated from this survey is rich. Others reviewing the detailed data included in Appendix B may reach other conclusions. It is the authors' hope, for example, that

individual states will make wide use of the raw data to understand the current situation in that state, possible impacts of state and local policies, and possible next steps. In the following section, the authors recommend a few next steps based on the results of the survey and other research that has been conducted in this area.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

---

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Recommendations

Based on the results of the survey, the authors believe that policymakers at the school district and state level should consider taking the following actions.

Recommendations for School Policymakers:

- **Encourage districts to adopt a new teacher support program.** The results of this survey add support to the view that new teacher support programs are effective in both retaining and recruiting teachers.
- **Encourage districts to adopt policies that include teachers in decision making.** Although this highly effective strategy may involve significant changes in the way the district does business, it does not require a large financial commitment.
- **Make the scheduling and structural changes necessary to increase collaboration between teachers.** Both interdisciplinary or team teaching and common planning time were rated by superintendents as highly effective in retaining teachers.
- **Implement policies that result in more small learning environments in the district.** When building new schools, carefully weigh both the pros and cons of the school's size. Consider breaking up large schools into smaller ones, perhaps creating schools-within-schools in the same building if necessary. Look for creative solutions in rural areas to avoid consolidation of small community schools into large, unconnected schools. This survey adds to the growing research in support of small schools. A majority of superintendents who have restructured schools to make them smaller rated this approach as "very successful."
- **Look to the district's own backyard for future**

teachers. Recruiting from and training in the community has been an effective strategy, particularly in low-wealth districts.

- **Work with the community to support "home-grown" teachers.** Pay attention to how communities can encourage and support its members to go into the teaching profession. Tuition support can come from local businesses. Organizations such as Future Teachers of America can be fostered in local schools. Newly graduated teachers who return to the local community can have their debt loads refinanced by community banks, and their mortgages can be let at better rates. Programs can be developed to provide child care for community members while they receive teacher training at local institutions. Also, programs can be devised to provide discounts at local businesses and on local transportation systems in urban settings. Finally, and more generally, statewide report cards can be developed that indicate the nature and extent of community support for recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers.

- **If the district is too small to implement many effective strategies for attracting and retaining teachers, collaborate with neighboring districts and regional organizations.** Many of the strategies listed as effective are less likely to be adopted in small districts or rural districts. Develop a network of schools to provide support to new teachers or to represent multiple schools at recruitment fairs held by colleges of education. These effective approaches may be beyond the resources of one district, but they may be possible with pooled resources.

- **Respond to the market if possible.** Attracting and keeping a science teacher might require a higher salary than doing the same with an elementary teacher. A majority of districts that have paid high-demand teachers more on the salary scale found this strategy to be "highly successful" in recruiting teachers. This approach may be more feasible and effective than increasing salaries for all teachers.

- **Partner with institutions of higher education.** Building a partnership with a college or university, which might include opportunities to aggressively recruit graduates, is an effective approach. Researchers such as Fleener (1999) and Mantle-Bromley, Gould, McWhorter, and Whaley (2000) have reported that graduates involved in clinical experiences in school settings experience higher

job satisfaction and remain in teaching in greater numbers during their novice years than those trained in traditional programs. Try to recruit graduates from programs that provide extensive clinical experiences in school settings for preservice teachers. Such programs typically involve partnerships with professional development schools.

Recommendations for State Policymakers:

- **Adopt policies that ensure equal access to high-quality new teacher support.** Rural and small districts in those states without state-level requirements are less likely to have new teacher support programs. In Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio (where such programs are mandated), rural and small districts adopt new teacher support programs at much greater rates. Although much has been written about urban new teacher support programs, much less is known about rural approaches. Further information should be gathered from these states about how small and rural districts provide support to new teachers, and appropriate policies should be adopted based on this information.

- **Encourage partnerships between institutions of higher education and K-12 schools.** Such partnerships can be effective not only in matching prospective teachers with districts in need but also in improving the preparation of teachers. Resources may need to be provided to make this more feasible in rural areas, where they currently occur much less often.

- **Support adequate funding for teacher preparation programs.** States that have not revised their funding policy for teacher-preparation programs since the late 1980s should consider doing so. During the past decade, the majority of teacher-preparation programs in the nation have been redesigned to include more intensive clinical experiences for teachers in training. State and higher education institutional funding policies often do not recognize the extra costs that such training entails, particularly in remote rural settings. These extra costs should be outweighed by the benefits of higher retention rates from better prepared teachers.

- **Increase the flexibility of pay schedules.** Many districts are manipulating current salary schedules in order to respond to market forces.

- **Keep small schools small.** State policy or practice

should not force small schools to become bigger. States should help small districts or rural districts come up with creative ways to address the challenges they face, so that small community schools are not unnecessarily consolidated into large schools. They also should examine whether funding formulas for operating or capital expenses encourage schools to become bigger. This research report adds retention of teachers to the list of benefits associated with smaller schools; such benefits include higher student achievement, increased graduation rates, and safer schools.

- **Develop support for a niche market.** The retraining of current staff opens up the possibility of a niche market for teacher-training institutions. Such institutions can develop programs that will allow current teachers to "retool" to meet new demands. In rural districts, these programs will have to be accessible, requiring mixes of on-site and distance-education delivery modes. If the retraining is aimed to move staff from one area of certification or licensure to another, state policymakers will need to craft policies that will make such shifts readily achievable, while ensuring that high standards are met.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

---

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

References

Allen, M., & Palaich, R. (2000). *In pursuit of quality teaching: Five key strategies for policymakers.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Available online: http://www.ecs.org/initiatives/geringer/Geringer%20Initiative%20Final.pdf (Executive summary also available online: http://www.ecs.org/initiatives/geringer/gerguidebook%20executive%20summary.htm)

American Association for Employment in Education. (1999). *Teacher supply and demand in the United States.* Columbus, OH: Author.

Bandiera de Mello, V., & Broughman, S. (1996). *Schools and staffing survey (SASS) by state—1993-94 schools and staffing survey: Selected state results* (NCES 96-312). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Available online: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/96312.pdf

Bryk, A. S. (1994, Fall). More good news that school organization matters. *Issues in Restructuring Schools, 7,* 6-8. Available online: http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/archives/completed/cors/Issues_in_Restructuring_Schools/ISSUES_NO_7_FALL_1994.pdf

Center for School Change. (1999). [Minnesota salary schedule review]. Unpublished data.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Available online: http://www.nctaf.org/publications/DoingWhatMattersMost.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher*

supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Available online: http://www.nctaf.org/publications/solving.pdf

Edwards, V. B. (Ed.). (2000, January 13). *Quality counts 2000: Who should teach?* [Special issue]. *Education Week, 19*(18). Available online: http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc00/

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., & Foleno, T. (2000). *A sense of calling: Who teaches and why.* New York: Public Agenda. Available online: http://www.publicagenda.org/specials/teachers/teachers.htm

Fleener, C. (1999). *Teacher attrition: Do DPS programs make a difference?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.

Grant, F. D. (2001, January). Fast-track teacher recruitment. *The School Administrator, 58*(1), 18-24.

Greenwall, R., Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(3), 361-396.

Harris, D. (2000). *Different methods, different results: New approaches to meta-analysis with applications to education production functions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Haselkorn, D., & Fiedler, E. (1999). *Learning the ropes: Urban teacher induction programs and practices in the United States.* Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers Inc. Excerpt available online: http://www.rnt.org/publications/ropes.html

Haselkorn, D., & Harris, L. (1998). *The essential profession: A national survey of public attitudes toward teaching, educational opportunity, and school reform.* Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers Inc. Excerpt available online: http://www.rnt.org/publications/essential.html

Howley, C., & Bickel, R. (2000). *When it comes to schooling, small works: School size, poverty, and student achievement.* Washington, DC: Rural School and Community Trust.

Hussar, W. J. (1999). *Predicting the need for newly hired teachers in the United States to 2008-09* (NCES 1999-026). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Available online: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/1999026.pdf

Johnson, T. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools.* New York: Basic Books.

Joravsky, B. (2000). *From dream to reality: Three Chicago small schools.* Chicago: Small Schools Coalition.

Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1993). Effects of school restructuring on the achievement and engagement of middle school students. *Sociology of Education, 66*(3), 164-187.

Lewis, L., Parsad, B., Carey, N., Bartfai, N., Farris, E., Smerdon, B., & Green, B. (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers* (NCES 1999-080). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Available online: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/1999080.pdf

Mantle-Bromley, C., Gould, L. M., McWhorter, B. A., & Whaley, D. C. (2000, Spring). The effect of program structure on new teachers' employment and program satisfaction patterns. *Action in Teacher Education, 22*(1), 1-14.

Merrow, J. (1999, October 6). The teacher shortage: Wrong diagnosis, phony cures. *Education Week* [Online]. Available: http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=06merrow.h19

Milken, L. (2000). *A matter of quality: A strategy for assuring the high caliber of America's teachers.* Santa Monica, CA: Milken Family Foundation. Executive summary available online: http://www.mff.org/tap/tap.taf?page=execsum

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1998). *The numbers game: Ensuring quantity and quality in the teaching work force.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (2000, Winter). Ensuring quality and quantity in the teaching work force: Policies that can make it happen [Special issue]. *The State Education Standard, 1*(1).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2001). *State and local action* [Online]. Available: http://www.nbpts.org/state_local/where/index.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Common core of data: Information on public schools and school districts in the United States* [Online]. Available: http://nces.ed.gov/CCD/

Nelson, F. H., Drown, R., & Gould, J. C. (2000). *Survey and analysis of teacher salary trends.* Washington, DC: American

Federation of Teachers. Available online: http://www.aft.org/research/survey00/salarysurvey00.pdf

Odden, A. (2000, January). New and better forms of teacher compensation are possible. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(5), 361-366.

Ohio's BEST (Building Excellent Schools for Today and the 21st Century). (1997). *The best teachers for Ohio's children: A report to the public about the status of teaching in Ohio.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Pittman, R. B., & Haughwout, P. (1987). Influence of high school size on dropout rate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9* (4), 337-343.

Podgursky, M. (2001, April 11). Should states subsidize national certification? *Education Week, 20*(30), 38, 40-41. Available online: http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=30podgursky.h20

Raywid, M. A. (1996). *Taking stock: The movement to create mini-schools, schools-within-schools, and separate small schools* [Online]. Available: http://eric-web.tc.columbia.edu/monographs/uds108/

Sclan, E. M. (1993, April 12). *The effect of perceived workplace conditions on beginning teacher's work commitment, career choice commitment, and planned retention.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361 916)

Urbanski, A., & Erskine, R. (2000, January). School Reform, TURN, and teacher compensation. *Phi Delta Kappan 81*(5), 367-370.

U.S. Department of Education Initiative on Teaching. (2000). *Eliminating barriers to improving teaching.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education Initiative to Ensure a Talented, Dedicated, and Well-Prepared Teacher in Every Classroom. (1999). *A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in every classroom: Information kit.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Available online: http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/invest/

Whitener, S. D., Gruber, K., Lynch, H., Tingos, K., & Fondelier, S. (1997). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results*

from the teacher followup survey 1994-95 (NCES 97-450). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Available online: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97450.pdf

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Appendix A. Survey Instrument

RETAINING AND ATTRACTING HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS

Survey of ** State Name Here Superintendents**

The Center for School Change at the University of Minnesota, in collaboration with the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, is interested in discovering what strategies you have implemented to attract and retain high-quality teachers and the effectiveness of these strategies. We need to learn from your experience. Your input will help guide individual schools, school districts, and state-level policymakers as they make decisions about how to address this important issue. Please contact Debra Hare at the Center for School Change at (612) 626-1834 if you have any questions.

1. Please provide us with your District Name_____ Number_____ (This information is being collected to ensure a representative sample. All identifying information will remain confidential).

RETAINING HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS

2. Does your district have difficulty retaining high-quality teachers?
- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No

3. Does your district have a new teacher support program (e.g., mentorship, induction) in place?
- ❑ Yes
- ❑ No (skip to question 8 on page 2)

4. How many years has your new teacher support program been in operation? _____

5. In the left column, indicate with a checkmark all attributes that apply to your new teacher support program. In the right column, check the three attributes that you believe are the most important for program success.

Check all the attributes that apply to your new teacher support program	Attributes for Success (check ONLY three)
❑ The program is mandatory for all new teachers.	❑
❑ Funding is currently adequate to support all interested new teachers.	❑
❑ The program includes one-on-one mentoring with an experienced teacher.	❑
❑ The program includes additional training or professional development for the new teacher.	❑
❑ The program includes training for mentor teachers.	❑
❑ The program includes training for administrators on how to effectively support new teachers.	❑
❑ The program includes training for administrators on how to effectively support new mentors.	❑
❑ Mentor teachers are compensated financially.	❑
❑ Mentor teachers receive release time to participate in the program.	❑
❑ New teachers are given a reduced teaching load to participate in the program.	❑
❑ The program is linked to state standards for teachers.	❑
❑ The program is linked to state standards for K-12 students.	❑

6. Please estimate how effective this program has been at

reducing the number of high-quality teachers who leave your district in the first three to five years. (Check only ONE option per column)

Teachers leaving in years 1-3	Teachers leaving in years 3-5	
❑	❑	Very successful (has reduced attrition by 50% or more)
❑	❑	Moderately successful (has reduced attrition some, but less than 50%)
❑	❑	Not very successful (has not reduced attrition)
❑	❑	Program is too new to tell

7. How are teachers in your new teacher support program assessed? (Check all that apply)

❑ By a portfolio ❑ By the principal ❑ By mentor teacher

❑ By standardized test ❑ By a committee ❑ By department head

8. Please check strategies your district has used to retain high-quality teachers and, if applicable, indicate how successful you think the strategies have been.

Check all that apply and circle the appropriate level of effectiveness	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful
❑ Restructured schools to make them smaller	2	1	0
❑ Made scheduling changes that allow common planning time for same grade or same subject teachers	2	1	0
❑ Implemented team or interdisciplinary teaching	2	1	0
❑ Increased compensation for all	2	1	0

teachers			
❑ Increased compensation for beginning teachers	2	1	0
❑ Increased compensation based on knowledge and skills	2	1	0
❑ Created new career ladders for teachers involving greater responsibility for increased compensation	2	1	0
❑ Improved staff development (other than a new teacher support program)	2	1	0
❑ Recruited from and trained in the local community	2	1	0
❑ Financially rewarded successful teachers	2	1	0
❑ Financially rewarded all teachers for a school's success	2	1	0
❑ Offered one-time financial rewards for staying in job a certain number of years	2	1	0
❑ Provided nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers	2	1	0
❑ Provided support for National Board for Prof. Teaching certification	2	1	0
❑ Involved teachers in decision-making processes	2	1	0
❑ Other (please specify)	2	1	0

9. As you think about the teachers who have left your district for reasons other than maternity/ paternity or retirement in the past five years, please provide a rough estimate of the percentage of these teachers who fit into

the following categories? (Should add up to 100%)
_____% Highly effective
_____% Effective
_____% Ineffective

ATTRACTING HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS

10. Check the strategies your district has used to attract high-quality applicants for open teaching positions and, if applicable, indicate how successful you think the strategies have been.

Check all that apply and circle the appropriate level of effectiveness	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful
❑ Offered signing bonuses	2	1	0
❑ Given salary schedule credit for relevant non-teaching experience	2	1	0
❑ Provided retraining of current staff for high needs areas	2	1	0
❑ Trained paraprofessionals to meet needs	2	1	0
❑ Recruited candidates prepared in alternative preparation programs	2	1	0
❑ Aggressively recruited from teacher preparation programs	2	1	0
❑ Established new school-university partnerships	2	1	0
❑ Offered support to beginning teachers in the form of mentors, etc.	2	1	0
❑ Hired new teachers under temporary license	2	1	0

(emergency/provisional)			
❑ Offered salary schedule credit for higher education teaching experience	2	1	0
❑ Placed high demand teachers above entry-level on the salary scale	2	1	0

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
Please return the survey by November 3 to the Center for School Change at:
234 Humphrey Center, 301 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 1. Summary of Total Sample

State	Number of Districts	Number of Surveys Returned	Percentage of Surveys Returned	Two-Sided Confidence Interval at 99% (plus or minus %)
Illinois	895	596	66%	3%
Indiana	293	212	72%	4.5%
Iowa	375	311	83%	3%
Michigan	556	351	63%	4%
Minnesota	345	277	80%	2.75%
Ohio	615	411	67%	3.5%
Wisconsin	427	255	60%	5%
Total for Region	3605	2413	69%	2%

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 2. Representativeness of the Sample Bas Poverty Level

(Excludes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CC

State	Greater Than or Equal to 50% of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunches		25%-49% of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunches		10%-24% of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunches		Less T of St Receiv or Re Price L
	All Districts % (n)	Sample % (n)	All Districts % (n)	Sample % (n)	All Districts % (n)	Sample % (n)	All District % (n)
Illinois	8.6% (77)	8% (40)	30.8% (274)	30% (150)	32.7% (292)	34% (168)	27.8% (248)
Indiana	2.9% (8)	2.6% (5)	32.5% (89)	33.3% (65)	55.5% (152)	54.9% (107)	9.1% (25)
Iowa	3.7% (13)	3% (9)	51.5% (183)	50.3% (151)	42.3% (150)	43.3% (130)	2.5% (9)
Michigan	10.7% (59)	8.6% (28)	44.3% (245)	43.1% (141)	28.9% (160)	33.6% (110)	16.1% (89)
Minnesota	2.7% (9)	2.7% (7)	20% (67)	20.8% (54)	59.7% (200)	59.2% (154)	17.6% (59)
Ohio	4.3% (26)	4.8% (18)	23.3% (140)	21.4% (80)	49.7% (298)	51.5% (192)	22.7% (136)
Wisconsin	3.5% (14)	2.2% (5)	27.5% (111)	28.5% (65)	46.7% (188)	46.9% (107)	22.3% (90)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 3. Representativeness of the Sample Bas Enrollment Level

(Excludes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCI

State	Greater Than or Equal to 10,000 Students		5,000-9,999 Students		1,000-4,999 Students		Less Th Stu
	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)	All District %(n)
Illinois	2% (18)	1.4% (7)	4.7% (42)	4.7% (23)	39.7% (352)	42.4% (208)	53.5% (474)
Indiana	6.2% (18)	6.4% (13)	11% (32)	12.9% (26)	69.4% (202)	66.3% (134)	13.4% (39)
Iowa	1.9% (7)	2% (6)	1.6% (6)	2% (6)	27.9% (104)	30% (90)	68.6% (256)
Michigan	4.7% (26)	4.9% (16)	8.3% (46)	9.5% (31)	58.4% (323)	60.9% (199)	28.6% (158)
Minnesota	4.2% (14)	3.8% (10)	5.4% (18)	5.8% (15)	44.5% (149)	46.2% (120)	46% (154)
Ohio	3.2% (19)	3.8% (14)	8.5% (51)	8.8% (33)	71.5% (429)	71% (265)	16.8% (101)
Wisconsin	2.7% (11)	2.2% (5)	3.7% (15)	4.4% (10)	45.9% (185)	47.8% (109)	47.6% (192)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 4. Representativeness of the Sample Based on Location

(Excludes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data)

State	Urban*		Suburban**		Rural***	
	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)	All Districts %(n)	Sample %(n)
Illinois	3.6% (32)	4.3% (21)	37.2% (331)	35.6% (175)	59.2% (527)	60.1% (296)
Indiana	7.5% (22)	9.5% (19)	16.8% (49)	16.6% (33)	75.7% (221)	73.9% (147)
Iowa	2.9% (11)	2.7% (8)	1.6% (6)	2% (6)	95.5% (358)	95.3% (286)
Michigan	3.8% (21)	3% (10)	19.9% (110)	20.7% (68)	76.3% (423)	76.3% (250)
Minnesota	1.8% (6)	1.9% (5)	16.6% (57)	17% (45)	81.6% (280)	81.1% (215)
Ohio	4.3% (26)	4.6% (17)	26.8% (164)	29.9% (111)	68.9% (421)	65.5% (244)
Wisconsin	4% (17)	4.2% (10)	13.4% (57)	15.9% (38)	82.6% (352)	79.9% (190)

*Urban is defined as NCES locale codes 1 (Large City) and 2 (Midsize City)

**Suburban is defined as NCES locale codes 3 (Urban Fringe of Large City) and 5 (Large Town)

***Rural is defined as NCES locale codes 4 (Urban Fringe of Midsize City), 6 (Small Town), 7 and 8 (Rural)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 5. Percentage and Number of Districts Reporting Difficulty Retaining Teachers

(Q 2)

State	Including Anonymous Surveys	Excluding Anonymous Surveys
Illinois	35.2% (210)	35.7% (177)
Indiana	30.7% (65)	31.2% (64)
Iowa	43.7% (136)	43.2% (130)
Michigan	21.9% (77)	21.8 (72)
Minnesota	39.4% (109)	39.6% (105)
Ohio	32.8% (135)	33.4% (128)
Wisconsin	30.6% (78)	30.6% (75)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 6. Percentage and Number of Districts Reporting Difficulty Retaining Teachers by Location

(Q 2)

State	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Location Unknown*
Illinois	28% (7)	33.1% (58)	37.8% (112)	33% (33)
Indiana	10.5% (2)	33.3% (11)	33.3% (51)	14.3% (1)
Iowa	12.5% (1)	50% (3)	43.9% (126)	60% (6)
Michigan	40% (4)	22.1% (15)	21.2% (53)	21.7% (5)
Minnesota	20% (1)	37.8% (17)	40.5% (87)	33.3% (4)
Ohio	64.7% (11)	21.4% (24)	36.6% (93)	25% (7)
Wisconsin	40% (4)	7.9% (3)	36.5% (72)	30% (3)

*Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 7. Percentage and Number of Districts Reporting Difficulty Retaining Teachers by Poverty Level (Percentage of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunch)

(Q 2)

State	Equal to or Greater Than 50%	25%-49%	10%-24%	Less Than10%	Level Unknown*
Illinois	42.5% (17)	38.7% (58)	40.5% (68)	24.6% (34)	33% (33)
Indiana	20% (1)	39.4% (26)	28.4% (31)	21.7% (5)	22.2% (2)
Iowa	66.7% (6)	49% (74)	35.1% (46)	40% (4)	60% (6)
Michigan	42.9% (12)	26.4% (37)	15.3% (17)	12.5% (6)	20.8% (5)
Minnesota	57.1% (4)	38.9% (21)	36.4% (56)	46.7% (21)	41.2% (7)
Ohio	61.1% (11)	41.3% (33)	36.5% (70)	14.3% (13)	26.7% (8)
Wisconsin	20% (1)	45.6% (31)	31.2% (34)	9.8% (5)	31.8 % (7)

* Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 8. Percentage and Number of Districts Reporting Difficulty Retaining Teachers by Enrollment (Number of Students)

(Q 2)

State	Greater Than or Equal to 10,000 Students	5,000-9,999 Students	1,000-4,999 Students	Less Than 1,000 Students	Enrollment Unknown*
Illinois	37.5% (3)	26.1% (6)	28.4% (59)	42.5% (107)	33.3% (35)
Indiana	23.1% (3)	19.2% (5)	33.6% (46)	34.5% (10)	14.3% (1)
Iowa	25% (1)	0	28.9% (26)	51.2% (103)	60% (6)
Michigan	18.8% (3)	9.7% (3)	20.6% (41)	30.9% (25)	20.8% (5)
Minnesota	40% (4)	33.3% (5)	33.3% (40)	46.1% (53)	41.2% (7)
Ohio	50% (7)	26.5% (9)	30.2% (81)	45.5% (30)	27.6% (8)
Wisconsin	40% (2)	18.2% (2)	27.7% (31)	37.6% (44)	30% (3)

* Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 9. Percentage and Number of Districts With New Teacher Support Programs

(Q 3)

Response	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisconsi
Yes	57.6% (343)	86.8% (184)	43.7% (136)	92.9% (326)	63.9% (177)	90.8% (373)	68.2% (174)
No	41.1% (245)	12.3% (26)	53.7 % (167)	6.8% (24)	36.1% (100)	8% (33)	29.4% (75)
Blank	1.3% (8)	0.9% (2)	2.6% (8)	.3% (1)	0	1.2% (5)	2.4% (6)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 10. Percentage and Number of Districts With New Teacher Support Programs by Location

(Q 3)

State	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Location Unknown*
Illinois	68% (17)	73.3% (129)	44.6% (132)	65% (65)
Indiana	100% (19)	90.9% (30)	83.7% (128)	100% (7)
Iowa	87.5% (7)	66.7% (4)	41.8% (120)	50% (5)
Michigan	80% (8)	95.6% (65)	92.8% (232)	91.3% (21)
Minnesota	80% (4)	88.9% (40)	59.1% (127)	50% (6)
Ohio	82.4% (14)	87.5% (98)	92.1% (234)	96.4% (27)
Wisconsin	100% (10)	81.6% (31)	62.9% (124)	90% (9)

*Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 11. Percentage and Number of Districts With New Teacher Support Programs by Poverty Level (Percentage of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunch)

(Q3)

State	Equal to or Greater Than 50%	25%-49%	10%-24%	Less Than 10%	Level Unknown*
Illinois	55% (22)	48.7% (73)	56% (94)	64.5% (89)	65% (65)
Indiana	80% (4)	81.8% (54)	89% (97)	87% (20)	100% (9)
Iowa	11.1% (1)	40.4% (61)	45% (59)	100% (10)	50% (5)
Michigan	89.3% (25)	90.7% (127)	96.4% (107)	93.8% (45)	91.7% (22)
Minnesota	71.4% (5)	59.3% (32)	61% (94)	82.2% (37)	52.9% (9)
Ohio	88.9% (16)	90% (72)	91.1% (175)	89% (81)	96.7% (29)
Wisconsin	40% (2)	58.8% (40)	70.6% (77)	84.3% (43)	54.5% (12)

* Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 12. Percentage and Number of Districts With New Teacher Support Programs by Enrollment (Number of Students)

(Q 3)

State	Greater Than or Equal to 10,000 Students	5,000-9,999 Students	1,000-4,999 Students	Less Than 1,000 Students	Number Unknown*
Illinois	62.5% (5)	82.6% (19)	70.2% (146)	40.9% (103)	66.7% (70)
Indiana	100% (13)	96.2% (25)	85.4% (117)	75.9% (22)	100% (7)
Iowa	75% (3)	100% (6)	63.3% (57)	32.3% (65)	50% (5)
Michigan	100% (16)	96.8% (30)	93.5% (186)	88.9% (72)	91.7% (22)
Minnesota	100% (10)	80% (12)	77.5% (93)	46.1% (53)	52.9% (9)
Ohio	92.9% (13)	94.1% (32)	91% (244)	84.8% (56)	96.6% (28)
Wisconsin	100% (5)	100% (11)	81.3% (91)	49.6% (58)	90% (9)

*Includes anonymous surveys and districts that could not be linked to CCD data.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 13. Number of Years That New Teacher Support Programs Have Been in Operation

(Q 4)

Years	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisconsi
0 Through 2 Years	31.5% (108)	6% (11)	42.6% (58)	12.9% (42)	34.5% (61)	17.4% (65)	36.8% (64)
3 Through 9 Years	51% (175)	47.8% (88)	40.4% (55)	74.2% (242)	47.5% (84)	62.5% (233)	46.6% (81)
10 or More Years	12.5% (43)	38% (70)	14% (19)	9.5% (31)	10.7% (19)	14.7% (55)	10.9% (19)
Blank	5% (17)	8.2% (15)	2.9% (4)	3.4% (11)	7.3% (13)	5.4% (20)	5.7% (10)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 14. Percentage and Number of Districts W Teacher Support Program Attributes (Percent Districts With a Program)

(Q 5)

Attribute	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisco
Mandatory for all	71.1% (244)	79.3% (146)	71.3% (97)	81.6% (266)	74% (131)	82.3% (307)	74.1 (12
Funding adequate for all	40.8 (140)	39.7% (73)	40.4% (55)	50% (163)	36.2% (64)	44.5% (166)	51.1 (89
One-on-one mentoring	69.4% (238)	82.1% (151)	74.3% (101)	82.2% (268)	72.9% (129)	82.6% (308)	76.4 (13
Training for new teacher	62.1% (213)	60.3% (111)	56.6% (77)	80.4% (262)	65.6% (116)	67.8% (253)	61.5 (10
Training for mentor teacher	39.1% (134)	60.9% (112)	48.5% (66)	39.6% (129)	45.2% (80)	80.2% (299)	51.7 (90
Administrator training on support of new teachers	17.8% (61)	26.1% (48)	21.3% (29)	23% (75)	16.4% (29)	20.1% (75)	19.5 (34
Administrator training on support of mentors	9% (31)	15.8% (29)	10.3% (14)	12% (39)	6.2% (11)	14.2% (53)	11.5 (20
Compensation for mentors	34.1% (117)	76.1% (140)	49.3% (67)	50.3% (164)	47.5% (84)	71.8% (268)	42.5 (74
Release time for mentors	22.4% (77)	58.7% (108)	24.3% (33)	26.1% (85)	31.1% (55)	46.6% (174)	29.9 (52
Reduced teaching load for new	1.2% (4)	2.2% (4)	0% (0)	1.2% (4)	1.1% (2)	.5% (2)	1.1 (2)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teachers							
Linked to state standards for teachers	25.9% (89)	41.8% (77)	10.3% (14)	43.3% (141)	18.6% (33)	55.5% (207)	37.4' (65
Linked to state standards for students	25.9% (89)	26.6% (49)	12.5% (17)	31.6% (103)	24.9% (44)	35.1% (131)	31% (54

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserve
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCREL North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Home

Educational Policy Publications

Emerging Issues
Meetings and Activities
NCREL Advisory Networks
Publications
Issue Scanning
State-Specific Information
Resources

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 15. Most Important Attributes for a Succ New Teacher Support Program: Percentage Number of Districts That Listed Each Attribute of Top Three

(Q 5)

Attribute	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisco
Mandatory for all	61.2% (210)	70.1% (129)	55.1% (75)	65.6% (214)	56.5% (100)	61.7% (230)	60.3 (10
Funding adequate for all	20.4% (70)	18.5% (34)	23.5% (32)	16.6% (54)	23.7% (42)	22.3% (83)	16.7 (29
One-on-one mentoring	64.1% (220)	68.5% (126)	65.4% (89)	69.3% (226)	62.1% (110)	66% (246)	62.6 (10
Training for new teacher	44% (151)	37% (68)	41.9% (57)	64.7% (211)	41.2% (73)	37% (138)	39.1 (68
Training for mentor teacher	32.1% (110)	28.3% (52)	30.1% (41)	24.2% (79)	26.6% (47)	51.7% (193)	34.5 (60
Administrator training on support of new teachers	12% (41)	10.3% (19)	8.8% (12)	10.1% (33)	4% (7)	9.9% (37)	9.8 (17
Administrator training on support of mentors	2.3% (8)	3.8% (7)	.7% (1)	2.5% (8)	.6% (1)	2.7% (10)	2.9 (5)
Compensation for mentors	16.6% (57)	17.4% (32)	27.2% (37)	16.9% (55)	24.3% (43)	20.4% (76)	10.9 (19
Release time for mentors	8.5% (29)	14.1% (26)	8.8% (12)	5.8% (19)	15.8% (28)	10.5% (39)	10.9 (19
Reduced							

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teaching load for new teachers	2.3% (8)	2.2% (4)	2.2% (3)	2.1% (7)	3.4% (6)	1.3% (5)	1.1% (2)
Linked to state standards for teachers	8.5% (29)	18.5% (34)	1.5% (2)	5.5% (18)	5.6% (10)	10.7% (40)	12.6% (22)
Linked to state standards for students	5.5% (19)	7.1% (13)	5.9% (8)	8% (26)	4.5% (8)	7.8% (29)	5.7% (10)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserve
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Is Making Use of Them?

Table 16. Effectiveness of New Teacher Support Programs in Reducing Attrition Among Teachers in Years 1-3

(Q 6)

State	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Too New to Tell	Blank
Illinois	30.3% (104)	19% (65)	5.8% (20)	26.2% (90)	18.7% (64)
Indiana	34.2% (63)	27.2% (50)	13% (24)	9.8% (18)	15.7% (29)
Iowa	22.8% (31)	22.8% (31)	1.5% (2)	30.9% (42)	22.1% (30)
Michigan	31.9% (104)	19% (62)	6.7% (22)	21.5% (70)	20.9% (68)
Minnesota	27.1% (48)	20.9% (37)	4% (7)	31.1% (55)	16.9% (30)
Ohio	30% (112)	20.4% (76)	7% (26)	20.9% (78)	20.9% (78)
Wisconsin	27% (47)	16.1% (28)	6.9% (12)	31.6% (55)	18.4% (32)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved.
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 17. Methods for Assessing New Teach Percentage and Number of Districts Reporting Method

(Q 7)

Method of Assessment	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wiscon
Portfolio	9% (31)	8.2% (15)	2.9% (4)	6.7% (22)	10.2% (18)	9.7% (36)	17.2% (30)
Standardized test	.6% (2)	.5% (1)	0	0	.6% (1)	2.1% (8)	0
Principal	90.4% (310)	96.2% (177)	94.1% (128)	96.6% (315)	90.4% (160)	81% (302)	92.5% (161)
Committee	6.1% (21)	1.6% (3)	4.4% (6)	3.1% (10)	9% (16)	5.4% (20)	4% (7)
Mentor teacher	30.3% (104)	75.5% (139)	33.1% (45)	39.3% (128)	44.6% (79)	63.5% (237)	34.5% (60)
Department head	14.3% (49)	23.9% (44)	3.7% (5)	7.7% (25)	8.5% (15)	9.9% (37)	9.2% (16)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserve
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 18. Percentage and Number of Districts Tl Used Each Strategy for Retaining Teache

(Q 8)

Strategy	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisc
Restructured schools to make them smaller	13.9% (83)	11.8% (25)	10.6% (33)	16% (56)	9% (25)	15.8% (65)	17.((4
Scheduled changes for common planning time	46.3% (276)	56.1% (119)	44.7% (139)	59.4% (208)	46.2% (128)	62.8% (258)	68.((17
Implemented team or interdisciplinary teaching	42.6% (254)	51.4% (109)	40.5% (126)	55.7% (195)	41.2% (114)	52.8% (217)	45.((11
Increased compensation for all teachers	54.2% (323)	49.1% (104)	44.4% (138)	48.6% (170)	57% (158)	56.4% (232)	31.((8
Increased compensation for new teachers	34.7% (207)	25.9% (55)	35.4% (110)	26% (91)	46.2% (128)	26.3% (108)	26.7 (6(
Increased compensation based on knowledge/skill	6.7% (40)	3.3% (7)	4.8% (15)	5.1% (18)	6.1% (17)	5.8% (24)	6.3 (1(
Created new career ladders	4% (24)	2.4% (5)	1.9% (6)	2% (7)	5.1% (14)	4.1% (17)	3.9 (1(
Improved staff development	70.3% (419)	79.2% (168)	69.1% (215)	73.7% (258)	62.5% (173)	74.9% (308)	64.3 (16
Recruited from and trained in	29.5%	27.8%	27.7%	27.4%	22%	35.5%	20'

the community	(176)	(59)	(86)	(96)	(61)	(146)	(5
Financially rewarded successful teachers	2.3% (14)	2.4% (5)	1.9% (6)	1.7% (6)	2.9% (8)	1.5% (6)	1.2 (3
Financially rewarded all teachers for school success	4% (24)	4.2% (9)	2.9% (9)	3.1% (11)	3.2% (9)	5.4% (22)	2.4 (6
Provided one-time financial rewards for staying	5.2% (31)	.9% (2)	1.6% (5)	2.6% (9)	5.1% (14)	5.6% (23)	2% (5
Provided nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers	16.4% (98)	17.9% (38)	15.1% (47)	19.4% (68)	11.6% (32)	20.7% (85)	22 (5
Received support for National Board certification	16.1% (96)	15.1% (32)	21.9% (68)	8% (28)	11.9% (33)	33.6% (138)	13.7 (3
Involved teachers in decision making	75% (447)	75% (159)	80.1% (249)	80% (280)	69.3% (192)	78.8% (324)	78.4 (20
Other	4.2% (25)	2.8% (6)	3.2% (10)	3.7% (13)	3.6% (10)	2.4% (10)	5.1 (1

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserv
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who

Table 19. Percentage and Number of District Indicating the Level of Effectiveness for

(Q 8)

Strategy	Illinois			Indiana	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moderat Success
Restructured schools to make them smaller	60.8% (48)	38% (30)	1.3% (1)	41.7% (10)	58.3% (14)
Scheduled changes for common planning time	51% (134)	46.4% (122)	2.7% (7)	46.1% (53)	50.4% (58)
Provided team or interdisciplinary teaching	48.1% (116)	49.8% (120)	2.1% (5)	43.1% (44)	55.9% (57)
Increased compensation for all teachers	45% (138)	51.5% (158)	3.6% (11)	40.6% (39)	50% (48)
Increased compensation for new teachers	48.7% (96)	46.2% (91)	5.1% (10)	37.3% (19)	43.1% (22)
Increased compensation based on knowledge/skill	47.4% (18)	39.5% (15)	13.2% (5)	16.7% (1)	66.7% (4)
Created new career ladders	27.3% (6)	40.9% (9)	31.8% (7)	0	80% (4)
Improved staff development	49.5% (199)	48.3% (194)	2.2% (9)	38.6% (61)	57% (90)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recruited from and trained in community	49.1% (82)	47.9% (80)	3% (5)	49.1% (27)	49.1% (27)
Financially rewarded successful teachers	15.4% (2)	46.2% (6)	38.5% (5)	60% (3)	20% (1)
Financially rewarded all teachers for school success	25% (5)	50% (10)	25% (5)	50% (4)	37.5% (3)
Provided one-time financial rewards for staying	41.9% (13)	38.7% (12)	19.4% (6)	50% (1)	0
Provided nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers	40.9% (38)	47.3% (44)	11.8% (11)	52.6% (20)	44.7% (17)
Received support for National Board certification	16.1% (14)	51.7% (45)	32.2% (28)	37.9% (11)	27.6% (8)
Involved teachers in decision making	51.7% (218)	45.3% (191)	3.1% (13)	48.6% (70)	47.2% (68)

Previous | Table of Contents

policywww@contact.ncrel.or
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Labor
Disclaimer and copyright informa

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who

Table 20. Percentage and Number of Districts i Indicating the Level of Effectiveness for

(Q 8)

Strategy	Michigan			Minnesc	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moderat Success
Restructured schools to make them smaller	59.6% (31)	38.5% (20)	1.9% (1)	60.9% (14)	39.1% (9)
Scheduled changes for common planning time	52.6% (103)	45.4% (89)	2% (4)	54.9% (67)	43.4% (53)
Provided team or interdisciplinary teaching	50.5% (93)	49.5% (91)	0	44.4% (48)	53.7% (58)
Increased compensation for all teachers	33.1% (53)	58.1% (93)	8.8% (14)	22.7% (34)	70% (105)
Increased compensation for new teachers	46.1% (41)	50.6% (45)	3.4% (3)	28.6% (34)	64.7% (77)
Increased compensation based on knowledge/skill	35.3% (6)	52.9% (9)	11.8% (2)	18.8% (3)	68.8% (11)
Created new career ladders	14.3% (1)	71.4% (5)	14.3% (1)	21.4% (3)	64.3% (9)
Improved staff development	48.1% (117)	49% (119)	2.9% (7)	37.5% (60)	60% (96)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recruited from and trained in community	57.3% (51)	41.6% (37)	1.1% (1)	48.1% (25)	48.1% (25)
Financially rewarded successful teachers	16.7% (1)	50% (3)	33.3% (2)	25% (2)	50% (4)
Financially rewarded all teachers for school success	18.2% (2)	63.6% (7)	18.2% (2)	11.1% (1)	66.7% (6)
Provided one-time financial rewards for staying	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	57.1% (4)	35.7% (5)	42.9% (6)
Provided nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers	40.3% (27)	49.3% (33)	10.4% (7)	37% (10)	63% (17)
Received support for National Board certification	16% (4)	32% (8)	52% (13)	10.7% (3)	42.9% (12)
Involved teachers in decision making	56.7% (149)	41.1% (108)	2.3% (6)	40.3% (71)	52.8% (93)

Previous | Table of Contents

policywww@contact.ncrel.or
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Labor
Disclaimer and copyright inform

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who of Them?

Table 21. Percentage and Number of Distri Wisconsin and the Region Indicating the Le Effectiveness for Each Retainment Strate

(Q 8)

Strategy	Wisconsin			Regio	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moderat Success
Restructured schools to make them smaller	56.1% (41)	43.9% (18)	0	54.6% (171)	44.1% (138)
Scheduled changes for common planning time	49.7% (83)	49.1% (82)	1.2% (2)	51.4% (639)	46.3% (576)
Provided team or interdisciplinary teaching	47.8% (54)	49.6% (56)	2.7% (3)	47.2% (508)	51.4% (553)
Increased compensation for all teachers	30.1% (22)	61.6% (45)	8.2% (6)	35.9% (408)	57.3% (652)
Increased compensation for new teachers	43.8% (28)	48.4% (31)	7.8% (5)	40.5% (296)	52.5% (383)
Increased compensation based on knowledge/skill	53.3% (8)	33.3% (5)	13.3% (2)	34.9% (44)	49.2% (62)
Created new career ladders	33.3% (3)	44.4% (4)	22.2% (2)	25.3% (20)	51.9% (41)

EST COPY AVAILABLE

Improved staff development	48.1% (75)	50.6% (79)	1.3% (2)	44.6% (722)	52.6% (852)
Recruited from and trained in the community	41.7% (20)	50% (24)	8.3% (4)	51.6% (326)	45.1% (285)
Financially rewarded successful teachers	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	23.9% (11)	47.8% (22)
Financially rewarded all teachers for school success	83.3% (5)	0	16.7% (1)	32.5% (27)	42.2% (35)
Provided one-time financial rewards for staying	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)	31.3% (26)	39.8% (33)
Provided nonfinancial rewards to successful teachers	42.3% (22)	55.8% (29)	1.9% (1)	38.9% (158)	54.7% (222)
Received support for National Board certification	35.5% (11)	32.3% (10)	32.3% (10)	23.1% (91)	50.8% (200)
Involved teachers in decision making	53% (98)	44.9% (83)	2.2% (4)	51.8% (899)	45% (782)

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reser
Disclaimer and copyright information.

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Use of Them?

Table 22. Effectiveness Level of Teachers Lea

(Q 9)

Percentage of Teachers Who Are Effective or Very Effective	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wisconsi
75%-100%	57.9% (300)	52.8% (103)	57.7% (165)	55% (166)	52.2% (129)	52.9% (183)	50% (115)
50%-74%	18.7% (97)	21.5% (42)	26.9% (77)	17.5% (53)	23.5% (58)	21.1% (73)	22.6% (52)
26%-50%	12.9% (67)	16.4% (32)	13.3% (38)	12.9% (39)	15.4% (38)	15.3% (53)	19.1% (44)
0-25%	10.4% (54)	9.2% (18)	2.1% (6)	14.6% (44)	8.9% (22)	10.7% (37)	8.3% (19)
Blank							

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reserved
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who of Them?

Table 23. Percentage and Number of Districts T Used Each Strategy for Attracting Teach

(Q 10)

Strategy	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Wis
Offered signing bonuses	4.5% (27)	.9% (2)	4.2% (13)	2.3% (8)	7.6% (21)	3.2% (13)	6
Gave salary credit for nonteaching experience	17.3% (103)	11.3% (24)	17.4% (54)	21.4% (75)	33.2% (92)	12.4% (51)	2
Retrained current staff	23% (137)	17.9% (38)	19.6% (61)	23.4% (82)	24.9% (69)	19.5% (80)	2
Trained paraprofessionals	15.4% (92)	26.9% (57)	23.5% (73)	26.3% (92)	24.2% (67)	12.2% (50)	1
Recruited from alternative programs	8.7% (52)	11.3% (24)	12.9% (40)	8% (28)	16.2% (45)	13.9% (57)	1
Aggressively recruited from teacher-prep institutions	49.5% (295)	57.5% (122)	50.5% (157)	58.3% (204)	49.1% (136)	56.2% (231)	4
Established school-university partnerships	20% (119)	21.2% (45)	10.9% (34)	18.3% (64)	17.7% (49)	26.5% (109)	1
Offered support to beginning teachers	54.9% (327)	81.1% (172)	46% (143)	79.1% (277)	58.8% (163)	79.1% (325)	8
Hired teachers under temporary license	39.3% (234)	67.9% (144)	70.1% (218)	50.9% (178)	70.8% (196)	58.2% (239)	7
Offered salary credit for higher	16.1% (96)	11.3% (24)	17.7% (55)	14.9% (52)	22% (61)	19.2% (79)	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ed experience							
Placed high-demand teachers above entry level in salary	12.8% (76)	2.8% (6)	18% (56)	29.1% (102)	35.4% (98)	12.2% (50)	3

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Reser
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who

Table 24. Percentage and Number of Distric Indicating the Level of Effectiveness for

(Q 10)

Strategies	Illinois			Indi	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moder Succe
Offered signing bonuses	38.5% (10)	42.3% (11)	19.2% (5)	0	50 (1
Gave salary credit for nonteaching experience	48.5% (49)	49.5% (50)	2% (2)	33.3% (7)	57.1 (12
Retrained current staff	47.7% (62)	50% (65)	2.3% (3)	45.9% (17)	48.6 (18
Trained paraprofessionals	40.4% (36)	53.9% (48)	5.6% (5)	29.6% (16)	64.8 (35
Recruited from alternative programs	37.5% (18)	50% (24)	12.5% (6)	26.1% (6)	65.2 (15
Aggressively recruited from teacher-prep institutions	55.4% (153)	40.2% (111)	4.3% (12)	43.5% (50)	53.9 (62
Established school-university partnerships	43.3% (49)	52.2% (59)	4.4% (5)	50% (22)	45.5 (20
Offered support to beginning teachers	43% (130)	54.6% (165)	2.3% (7)	47% (77)	51.8 (85
Hired teachers under temporary license	40% (88)	51.8% (114)	8.2% (18)	20.9% (29)	73.4 (10
Offered salary	45.6%	50%	4.4%	31.8%	59.1

90 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

credit for higher ed experience	(41)	(45)	(4)	(7)	(13
Placed high-demand teachers above entry level in salary	55.6% (40)	40.3% (29)	4.2% (3)	33.3% (2)	50' (3

Previous | Table of Content

policywww@contact.ncrel.
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Lab
Disclaimer and copyright inform

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who

Table 25. Percentage and Number of Districts Indicating the Level of Effectiveness for

(Q 10)

Strategy	Michigan			Minne	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moder Succe
Offered signing bonuses	62.5% (5)	25% (2)	12.5% (1)	35% (7)	40 (8
Gave salary credit for nonteaching experience	51.4% (38)	45.9% (34)	2.7% (2)	41.6% (37)	57.3 (51
Retrained current staff	38% (30)	60.8% (48)	1.3% (1)	49.3% (33)	47.8 (32
Trained paraprofessionals	43.7% (38)	52.9% (46)	3.4% (3)	29.2% (19)	70.8 (46
Recruited from alternative programs	46.4% (13)	53.6% (15)	0	25.6% (11)	72.1 (31
Aggressively recruited from teacher-prep institutions	57.1% (112)	41.8% (82)	1% (2)	41.4% (53)	54.7 (70
Established school-university partnerships	62.3% (38)	36.1% (22)	1.6% (1)	30.4% (14)	65.2 (30
Offered support to beginning teachers	51.1% (137)	45.1% (121)	3.7% (10)	44.4% (68)	52.9 (81
Hired teachers under temporary license	40.4% (69)	56.1% (96)	3.5% (6)	39.5% (73)	57.3 (10
Offered salary	50%	44.2%	5.8%	42.6%	55.7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

credit for higher ed experience	(26)	(23)	(3)	(26)	(34
Placed high-demand teachers above entry level in salary	74.7% (74)	24.2% (24)	1% (1)	63.2% (60)	35.8 (34

Previous | Table of Content

policywww@contact.ncrel.
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Lab
Disclaimer and copyright inform

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCREL North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Educational Policy Publications

Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who Them?

Table 26. Percentage and Number of Districts in and the Region Indicating the Level of Effectiv Each Recruitment Strategy

(Q 10)

Strategy	Wisconsin			Regi	
	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Not Very Successful	Very Successful	Moder Succe
Offered signing bonuses	47.1% (8)	41.2% (7)	11.8% (2)	38.3% (36)	39.4 (37
Gave salary credit for nonteaching experience	50.7% (37)	45.2% (33)	4.1% (3)	44.1% (203)	52.8 (24
Retrained current staff	57.6% (38)	42.4% (28)	0	47% (241)	50.5 (25
Trained paraprofessionals	47.2% (17)	52.8% (19)	0	37% (166)	59.7 (26
Recruited from alternative programs	36.6% (15)	61% (25)	2.4% (1)	32.7% (90)	61.1 (16
Aggressively recruited from teacher-prep institutions	37.8% (42)	55% (61)	7.2% (8)	49.3% (589)	46.6 (55
Established school-university partnerships	27.7% (13)	70.2% (33)	2.1% (1)	43.1% (189)	53.1 (23
Offered support to beginning teachers	45.8% (77)	51.8% (87)	2.4% (4)	46.7% (695)	50.7 (75
Hired under temporary license	41.4% (72)	53.4% (93)	5.2% (9)	36.5% (482)	59 (78

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Offered salary credit for higher ed experience	54.2% (26)	45.8% (22)	0	45.6% (181)	50.1 (19
Placed high-demand teachers above entry level in salary	51.2% (44)	48.8% (42)	0	58.8% (270)	39.4 (18

Previous | Table of Contents

policywww@contact.ncrel.org
Copyright © North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All Rights Rese
Disclaimer and copyright information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").